

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2114. A bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2115. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2116. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2117. A bill to establish a war cabinet and to define the jurisdiction and authority thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2118. A bill to provide for universal service and total mobilization during any war in which the United States is now engaged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2119. A bill to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2120. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 514); to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation and study by the Federal Trade Commission of plans and problems with respect to the effective post-war operation of our economic system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to create a committee of peace aims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 151. Resolution to create a special committee on post-war economic policy and planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 152. Resolution to investigate curtailment of Government publications; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 153. Resolution providing additional compensation for chief pages of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to perform casual labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the time for which Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River to June 1, 1947; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States favoring the passage of House bill 997 and Senate bill 216; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to its waters and the use thereof by the adjoining States and the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

230. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Miss A. Campbell, of Hillsboro, Tex., favoring House Resolution No. 123; to the Committee on Labor.

231. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Resolution of Local No. 1116, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, opposing the Hobbs antiracketeering bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of Nevada, regarding statehood for the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

233. By Mr. WHITE: Senate Joint Memorial No. 6, of the Idaho State Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture.

234. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States of America, State of Washington Legislature, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 997 and Senate bill 216; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

235. By Mr. BARRETT: Memorial of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the time within which the States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River to June 1, 1947; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who putteth down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, Thy providence has led us as a nation across stern and stormy years to the very vestibule of destiny. In spite of our own shortcomings, which we confess with contrition, in this hour of world crisis Thou hast summoned us as trustees of civilization to defend the heritage of the ages and to help create institutions essential to human progress.

More and more may our strength be dedicated to the fulfillment of the ancient commission now put into our hands, to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captive and the opening of prison doors to them that are bound, to build the old wastes, to repair the ruined cities and the desolation of many generations. Forbid that our favored land throned in richness between the seas should in such an hour be tempted to ask "Who is to be the greatest in the coming kingdom of humanity?"

May she be the greatest as she becomes the servant of all.

We ask it in the name of that One who for the joy that was set before Him despised the shame and endured the cross. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 5, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 6, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidation and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California;

S. 641. An act to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers; and

S. 739. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places."

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 133) to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and Mr. BLAND, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. O'BRIEN of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2068), making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### DEATH OF PVT. MAX E. McCLELLAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has just received a message from North Africa advising him of the death of his son, Max E. McClellan, a private soldier in the Army of the United States, who volunteered for service to his country. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of all Senators, and all the friends and acquaintances of Senator McCLELLAN, when I say that we deeply sympathize with him in his great loss. I need not say that we are all deeply affected by the

sacrifice made by the Senator's son in behalf of his country in that far off land.

Mr. President, I felt that under these sad circumstances I should like to say this much, and I am sure I speak the sentiments of all Members of the Senate in expressing our profound grief over the sad news which has come to our friend the Senator from Arkansas.

CAPT. CLYDE E. HERRING

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from Kentucky has said, I am sure that every friend of former Senator Herring, of Iowa, noted with profound regret the statement in the newspaper this morning that news had come to Mr. Herring that his son, a captain in the American expeditionary forces abroad, had been reported missing in action. Every Member of this body, particularly those of us who served here with Senator Herring, have learned with very deep regret that this outstanding young man, formerly a captain in the Iowa National Guard, has been reported missing in action.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I share the feeling the Senator from Missouri has expressed. I had not heard about former Senator Herring's son, or I would have mentioned him in connection with what I said regarding the death of young Mr. McClellan. I appreciate the Senator from Missouri bringing the matter to our attention.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sure the Senator would have mentioned the news about young Captain Herring if he had heard the report.

#### AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC LAW OF PUERTO RICO—ELECTION OF GOVERNOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Several months ago the Governor of Puerto Rico recommended that the organic law of Puerto Rico be amended so as to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor. This recommendation was brought to me by the Secretary of the Interior with his approval. The Governor's suggestion has been under consideration since that time.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its Territories and island possessions.

Puerto Rico has universal suffrage and an elective legislature which considers and enacts measures governing its internal affairs. Laws enacted by its legislature, however, including laws of purely local concern, have been subject to approval or disapproval by Governors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

In accordance with the general policy of this Government, I recommend to the

Congress that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor, and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and the government of Puerto Rico, respectively.

I have appointed a committee composed of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and of continental residents to advise me concerning changes in the organic law.

The recommendations of this committee will be promptly submitted to the Congress for its consideration.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, March 9, 1943.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the President's recommendation is worthy of the consideration of the Senate, and I believe that every desire of the Puerto Ricans which is reasonably possible of attainment should always be considered by this body. However, I cannot escape the belief that the proposal referred to in the message is not going to solve the Puerto Rican problem. I think it might be well for the Congress to begin approaching the inevitable right now, which, in my judgment, would be to give Puerto Rico her independence, retaining for ourselves such naval and military bases as are essential, and granting Puerto Rico for a period of time certain trade preferences in this country equal to those she now enjoys, which would permit her to readjust her internal and external economy to suit the changed condition.

Puerto Rico was won by the United States by conquest. Its people never agreed by any sort of plebiscite to become a part of this country; and I should like to see the Puerto Ricans given their freedom, the right to determine in full their own destiny, subject always, of course, to the retention, with their consent, of military and naval bases on the island of Puerto Rico, for their protection as well as ours, and to give them such help as we could in order to make possible the transition from a state of dependence to a state of independence, as we have done in the case of the Philippine Islands. I should like to see the Puerto Ricans ask for that; I should like to see them go the whole length rather than merely to ask to elect their own Governor. I believe if such a course is taken, an end to the Puerto Rican problem will be reached, and until such a course is taken we will face a perpetual and never-solved problem pending continually before the Congress of the United States as well as with the Puerto Rican people.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 5th instant,

During the last adjournment of the Senate the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project,

and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The VICE PRESIDENT reappointed the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT reappointed the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### CLARIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 133) to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BAILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### PROVISION RELATING TO BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION (S. Doc. No. 17)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision relating to an existing appropriation for the Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 431 aliens whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

#### REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on January 31, 1943, under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORT OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

A letter from the secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.



## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Bragg and Fayetteville, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Local Union No. 9, Minneapolis city and county employees, Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require Senate confirmation of appointees to Federal positions with compensation of \$4,500 per annum or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Washington State Department of Social Security Employees, Pierce County, Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require Senate confirmation of appointees to Federal positions with compensation of \$4,500 per annum or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and Naval Establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

**"Senate Joint Resolution 1**

"A joint resolution memorializing Congress respecting the policy of the State of Utah relating to its waters and the use thereof by the adjoining States and the United States

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):*

"Whereas in the State of Utah there are rights of immense proportion which have been acquired in reliance upon State laws governing the use of water, and there are many enterprises awaiting development, which is possible only through the use of water; and

"Whereas differences of opinion have arisen regarding the respective rights and powers of the Federal and State Governments to control and administer the use of waters within the several States, with the result that the stability of existing property rights and the future development of the water resources of this State are threatened, and doubt is cast upon the authority of this State to exercise control over such use; and

"Whereas in order to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to litigation, the welfare of this State requires that action be taken to insure interstate comity in the use of water, and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of floodwaters to the end that litigation be avoided and the use and control of water be continued in the manner and under the laws as heretofore exercised: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in session assembled (the Governor concurring therein), That it is the policy of this State of Utah to maintain its jurisdiction and control over the rights to the use of the waters in this State, and to protect such rights as have been established under the laws thereof; be it further*

*"Resolved, That it is the policy of this State to protect rights to the beneficial use*

*of water within this State as against threatened uses outside of the State; be it further*

*"Resolved, That it is the policy of this State to promote harmonious relations with the United States and with other States in respect to the beneficial use of water, and to encourage the making of compacts with respect to such relationship; be it further*

*"Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Senators, and Representatives from the State of Utah, and the Governors of the States of Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Nevada."*

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.)

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

**"House Joint Memorial 2**

*"To the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America and the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session:*

*"Whereas the Congress of the United States enacted Public Law No. 674 as an amendment to the commodity credit provision permitting the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, etc., approved July 22, 1942; and*

*"Whereas the available evidence indicates Colorado farmers have greatly increased their inventory numbers of livestock and poultry, in accordance with an appeal from Federal officials necessitated by the need for foodstuffs to be used in the war effort; and*

*"Whereas there exists an ample supply of wheat in storage in the United States, and the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat authorized to be sold, have been sold and no more of such wheat is available for feeding the augmented number of livestock and poultry in the State of Colorado, and such wheat for feeding purposes is sorely needed: Now, therefore, be it*

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to authorize and empower the Secretary of Agriculture to arrange for the sale of additional wheat to the producers of livestock and poultry in the United States in such amounts as to alleviate the present protein feed shortage which has become an emergency threatening the supplies of foodstuffs now vital to the furtherance of the national war effort; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado."*

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

**"House Joint Memorial 3**

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to perform casual labor

"Whereas our American people, collectively as a nation, are waging the greatest all-out contest of all time; and

"Whereas the able-bodied manhood of America is either under arms or engaged in producing the sinews of war; and

"Whereas this has resulted in an acute labor shortage, threatening curtailment of the vital food supplies of our Nation, and increasing the costs of living; and

"Whereas it is next to impossible for old-age pensioners to live on what they are now receiving; and

"Whereas they desire as patriotic American citizens to do their part by contributing to this great war effort to the best of their abilities: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized, to amend, or at least suspend for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, the present restrictions in the Social Security Act to the end that any person who receives or is eligible to receive old-age assistance shall be permitted to do and perform odd jobs of labor, caretaking, and similar classes of casual work not in the general course of a trade or business, at such rates of pay commensurate with their abilities to perform the same, but in any event, in an amount not to exceed \$25 in any 1 month without being penalized therefor; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to our congressional representatives in the Congress of the United States."*

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

**"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1**

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation relating to reviews by United States district courts of decisions of Federal boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States

"Whereas the heads of departments, independent establishments, boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States, with the approval of the President of the United States, are vested with various and divers judicial powers over the life, liberty, and property of the people of the several States; and

"Whereas many of the decisions of said commissions and other agencies of the United States are arbitrary, capricious, and result in the taking of property without due process of law; and

"Whereas in most instances the decisions of these men are reviewed by the heads of the several departments of government and from their decisions no appeals can be taken to a court of competent jurisdiction; and

"Whereas the said Federal boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States frequently disregard the law and the facts and arrive at arbitrary and capricious decisions: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate (with the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact legislation permitting appeals to be taken from the decisions of all boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States to the United States district court in the district wherein the controversy arises, for hearing de novo upon the issues of law and fact; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, and to Representative FRANK A. BARRETT."*

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

**"Enrolled Joint Memorial 2**

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the time within which the States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River to June 1, 1947

"Whereas the Congress of the United States by the act of Congress approved August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 551), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 15, 1940 (Public, No. 632, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), has granted authority to the States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; and

"Whereas said States have diligently endeavored to negotiate such a compact, have appointed commissioners for that purpose and the commissioners did negotiate a tentative compact, which said compact was not approved by the legislatures of said States; and

"Whereas said States desire to continue such negotiations: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate (with the house of representatives concurring),* That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact suitable legislation for the purpose of extending the authority granted by the act of Congress approved August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 551), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 15, 1940 (Public, No. 632, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), to June 1, 1947; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, and to Representative FRANK A. BARRETT."

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Finance:

Memorial to the Congress of the United States:

"Whereas the Sixty-second General Assembly of Missouri is now convened in regular session; and

"Whereas this body experiences much difficulty in the execution of the Social Security laws of our State when drawn in conformity with the Federal Social Security Act; and

"Whereas much confusion and dissatisfaction is evidenced on the part of recipients and charges of unfairness and discrimination are rumored, thus casting many reflections upon the officers in charge of the Social Security operations in each county organized under said Social Security Act; and

"Whereas we feel that the fundamental principle of any democracy is vested in the voice of the people; and

"Whereas we believe the strongest counteracting force of political evil is public resentment when based upon the opinion of a well informed constituency; and

"Whereas we feel that exacting of burdensome taxes by any group of appointive officials only to be disbursed also by a like group of appointive officials with the taxpayer being deprived of the right to know who is the beneficiary, one bold step has been made in defiance of the principles of democracy and the American way of life which is the goal for which the greatest war in history is being waged; we therefore memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to the effect that any citizen in any county in any State thus organized under the Federal Social Security Act

may be informed upon request made to his local Social Security Board of the names of any recipients in any branch of the Social Security Department and the respective amounts of money each is receiving, or has received during the past year, and to liberalize the Social Security Act so as to remove the many limitations and conditions placed upon the States before they may obtain Federal funds, also to allow the States and local boards to exercise greater authority in the administration and payment of assistance to the needy."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

**"Senate Resolution 26**

"Whereas many Missouri communities are faced with dire economic distress and virtual abandonment due to the failure of national governmental agencies to use the natural resources and manpower of great areas of our State in the war program to the end that our population and economy be stabilized; providing employment near the homes of our people and thereby preventing the current migration of our population to the metropolitan areas where they are now being drawn by lucrative positions in war plants concentrated in those areas; and

"Whereas there are no governmental installations in the whole northern section of the State of Missouri and only four in the southern section, thereby leaving an area greater than that of any of the New England States with the exception of Maine, and having a population greater than that of at least four States in the Union without any governmental installation of any kind; and

"Whereas such Government contracts and installations in the war program in the State of Missouri have been concentrated in the metropolitan areas of St. Louis and Kansas City, the skilled labor from these inland sections has been taken from our communities and farms to live in crowded and less wholesome environmental conditions causing acknowledged housing shortages and because of such concentrations resulting in increased living costs and the needless disruption of homes, thereby increasing the social problems in these metropolitan areas; and

"Whereas the facts disclose that by every comparison our sister States have been more favored than the State of Missouri as for example:

"In the dollar valuation of war contracts per dollar of manufacturing activity in the States as of 1939 Kansas was awarded contracts in the amount of \$16.39 for every dollar of manufacturing activity which she had before the war. Nebraska received contracts equivalent to \$6.38 for every previous dollar that she had in manufacturing before the war. Arkansas received \$6.06. Oklahoma received \$3.02. But Missouri received contracts equivalent to only \$2.91.

"In the all-over value of war contracts thus far awarded the national per capita average is \$710.85. Our sister to the west, Kansas, has received from a bounteous government in war contracts a per capita average of \$1,083.21 as compared with a per capita average in Missouri with her two large cities included of \$452.24.

"As of September 30, 1943, war contracts had so changed the rank of our States in their relative manufacturing positions that we find Kansas advanced 15 places in the rank of manufacturing among the States.

"Oklahoma has bettered her position 6 places among the 48 States, Arkansas and Nebraska likewise are in an improved rank and though Missouri has always been further advanced in manufacturing than any of these she has, during the same period, fallen from her former position so that she has lost 5 places in her manufacturing rank with the other States; and

"Whereas Missouri is unselfishly furnishing her share of her youth to the Nation's armed forces and desires further to place her manpower and other resources to work in the war effort, and it seems incredible that such vast resources of men and natural materials cannot be employed within the area, not only to stabilize the present economy of the State but to provide a great employment opportunity for our young men in service when they return after victory; inasmuch as such installations could then be converted to peacetime operations as now planned in the sister States which have thus far been favored; and

"Whereas it has been the enunciated policy of our National Government to provide every possible means of securing the production of war matériel with a minimum of disruption and dislocation of the family life, the foundation of our democratic way, it then seems to us reasonable that more careful consideration of sites, facilities, labor, and resources of this State should be given by the agencies of our Government in Washington charged with the responsibility of locating these essential war enterprises: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of Missouri,* That we call upon the elected representatives of the people of our State in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and upon such other of our citizens in Washington as now hold offices of high trust, upon our elected State officials, and upon the commercial and civic leaders of all sections of the State that they act in concerted unison to bring these facts and these conditions to the attention of the President of the United States and to all departments and agencies of the Government dealing with the problems of securing war matériel, the acquiring of facilities, the establishing of training bases and the installation of war production units, to the end that the great State of Missouri may contribute in larger measure to the war effort and that her people and her resources may be fully utilized in speeding our Nation's effort to victory; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of our representatives in Washington, our elective State officers and the appropriate departmental, commercial, and civic executives as set forth above."

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

**"House Concurrent Resolution No. 7**

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to relieve all persons in active military service of the United States from payment of income taxes or gross income taxes on their compensation received from the Government for such service

"Whereas the United States is now engaged in the prosecution of war activities on every continent and on the high seas in every corner of the globe against the totalitarian forces of Germany, Italy, Japan, and their satellites; and

"Whereas several million American citizens are aiding the Nation in this titanic struggle, by serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy; and

"Whereas thousands of such loyal and brave Americans have already lost their lives in this war, and those living will expose theirs to the risk of loss of life; and

"Whereas it is difficult for members of the armed forces to devote full energy to the struggle at hand, if they are beset by finan-



cial worries such as the payment of taxes, etc.; and

"Whereas it would be fitting and proper that certain taxes such as net income taxes and gross income taxes imposed by the Federal Government and the various States and Territories of the United States and the political subdivisions thereof not be required of such members of the armed forces: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring),* That the Congress of the United States further amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by exempting all compensation received by persons while on active duty as members of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and all officers of the Public Health Service detailed by proper authority for duty either with the Army or the Navy from the payment of income taxes there- of either net income or gross income, imposed under the authority of the laws of the United States or the laws of any other State or Territory or any public or any political subdivision thereof; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each Member of Congress from South Dakota, including both Senators and Representatives, and to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress with the request that this matter receive their most earnest consideration."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

#### "Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the honorable the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and the Office of Price Administration of the United States, to oppose any modification of the existing sanitary acts provided for embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meats from countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease

*"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein):*

"Whereas were it not for the Federal embargo, foot-and-mouth disease would be the greatest disease menace to the livestock industry of South Dakota and the Nation; and

"Whereas from time to time a movement has developed to import fresh and frozen meat products from countries infested with foot-and-mouth disease; and

"Whereas the most eminent livestock sanitary authorities of this Nation agree that freezing will not surely destroy the germ of foot-and-mouth disease, and

"Whereas an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease would be an incalculable menace to the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That all Federal authorities be urgently requested to oppose any modification of the existing embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meat products from any and all countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease, be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to all representatives in the Congress and Senate of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Bureau of Animal Industry, and to the Office of Price Administration."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

#### "Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the alcohol production plant of the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, of Yankton, S. Dak., with a view of determining the possibility of establishment of a synthetic rubber plant at Yankton, S. Dak.

*"Be it resolved by the State Senate of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):*

"Whereas the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, organized under the laws of the State of South Dakota, with its principal place of business at Yankton, Yankton, County, S. Dak., will, on or after the 1st day of April 1943, be in production of alcohol from corn products; and

"Whereas the operating capacity of the plant of said corporation will be the reduction of approximately 2,000 bushels of corn per day, with a daily output capacity of 6,000 gallons of alcohol; and

"Whereas the production and manufacture of synthetic rubber is of the highest importance to the Nation in the present war emergency: Be it

*"Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States of America should investigate the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, its plant and equipment at Yankton, S. Dak., with a view to determining the advisability and possibility of establishing at Yankton, S. Dak., a synthetic rubber manufacturing plant; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of South Dakota."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

#### "House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution of the South Dakota Legislature memorializing the President and Congress to revise the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring),* That we hereby memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to revise the laws and regulations relating to the administration of Indian affairs for the following reasons and along the following lines:

"(a) That most of the said existing laws and regulations were formulated at a time when all the Indians were considered as wards and dependents of the Federal Government and incapable of assuming the duties, obligations, and station of citizenship;

"(b) That most of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation have now been accorded the legal status of citizenship, and have advanced in education and progress along the lines of racial development to a point where they should be treated as full citizens, and most of the restrictions and regulations limiting their rights and freedom of action should be removed;

"(c) That many of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation are now graduates of high schools and colleges, and all of them are capable of receiving full high school and college education;

"(d) That most of our Indian citizens have entered loyally into the present war and assumed the risks and duties of active warfare on the same basis as other citizens of the Nation, and their efforts should be recognized and rewarded accordingly.

"We therefore earnestly memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to consider the changed condition of Indian affairs and to revise the laws and regulations concerning them accordingly; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the national Congress, and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Dakota; all to be done by the Secretary of State upon the passage and approval of this resolution."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.)

#### "Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress concerning the condition of Indians

"Whereas deplorable conditions continue on the Indian reservations of South Dakota, with low living standards, lack of agricultural or other occupations, and impaired health; and

"Whereas these conditions appear to be steadily growing worse instead of better, with the Indian gradually becoming more dependent and more poorly equipped for either a happy or prosperous living, despite increased Federal appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

"Whereas the South Dakota Indian has shown his patriotism and his love for the American flag in the present world crisis: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring),* That the Indian Bureau recognize its obligations in the postwar period by conducting a thorough study in South Dakota of the Indians' health, living standards, and vocational opportunities, to the end that they may live a happier and more useful life; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to South Dakota Congressmen and to John Collier, Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

#### JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE—AIR COMMERCE LEGISLATION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present and ask to have appropriately referred a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont relating to Federal legislation affecting air commerce.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration House bill H. R. 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; and

Whereas air commerce (air lines) represents a minor part and private flying and fixed base operations represent a major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government, the pending legislation would deny to the States their inherent rights to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying and fixed base operations; and

Whereas by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

Whereas there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is vested with full power under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise if necessary; and

Whereas those men who are serving their country in the various branches of service are unable to voice their sentiments or opinions on this proposed legislation at this time; and they are the persons who have contributed more to the development of aviation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics when and if they return from active duty; and

Whereas there is ample time for such legislation to be considered in the future since consideration has not been given future developments and improvements which will change methods now used in the regulation of aircraft: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate and house of representatives,* That the Congress be respectfully requested that no favorable action be taken on the above-mentioned bills or any similar bill or bills by Congress until the present war is over and peace is established; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN, and Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senators, and Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Representative, from Vermont.

ASA S. BLOOMER,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,

*President of the Senate.*

Approved March 5, 1943.

WILLIAM H. WILLIS,

*Governor.*

#### RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FARMERS—SUSPENSION OF A. A. A. ACTIVITIES

Mr. BALL presented a resolution of the National Association of Farmers relating to the total suspension of A. A. A. activities for the duration of the war, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has recently raised the restrictions and penalties incidental to production of wheat, thereby admitting the folly of the doctrine of scarcity previously advocated by the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas the present and threatened food shortages have been largely brought about by the insistence of the Department of Agriculture upon restricted production and by its lack of capacity to appreciate and recognize the needs of the farmer as to farm machinery and manpower; and

Whereas there is a manifest tendency to add to the duties and powers of State and local Agricultural Adjustment Administration committees under the guise of war emergency and whereas these additional duties and powers are apparently designed to strengthen and perpetuate the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program; and

Whereas these above-mentioned factors are detrimental to increased farm production and consequently are hampering our whole war effort; and

Whereas these additional duties and powers could be more efficiently performed by local officials elected by popular vote and whereas the method of selection of the present Agricultural Adjustment Administration and allied boards is destructive of public confidence in the operation of said boards: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the National Association of Farmers,* That we recommend to Congress, legislation looking to the total suspension of Agricultural Adjustment Administration activities for the duration of the war, as we feel that the enormous reservoir of manpower now immobilized in Agricultural Adjustment Administration activities would be immensely more valuable if employed in actual farm production.

PAUL F. WARBURTON,

*President of Free Farmers of Minnesota.*

#### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter dated Homestead, Fla., February 28, 1943, and signed by seven church pastors. I read the letter, as follows:

HOMESTEAD, FLA., February 28, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

*Chairman of the Senate*

*Military Affairs Committee,*

*Senate Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We are writing to you, not personally, but as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States.

The congregation assembled at a union service at the First Methodist Church at Homestead, Fla., February 28, 1943, requested the undersigned pastors to write to you stating that the congregation desire and urge the passage by Congress of protective legislation for our armed forces—the sons of our homes—from the liquor and vice traffic, similar to that enacted by Congress in 1917 which Secretaries Baker and Daniels both declared to be exceedingly effective.

The congregation also requests that you read this action on the floor of the Senate and have it incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

O. SEWELL PALMER,

*Pastor, Methodist Church.*

J. E. JOHNSTONE,

*Pastor, First Baptist Church.*

R. E. HASTINGS,

*Pastor, Church of God.*

EARL P. SCOTT,

*Church of the Nazarene.*

Mr. President, I have complied with their request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter presented by the Senator from North Carolina will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 791. A bill to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named; without amendment (Rept. No. 97).

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. McKellar), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 1975. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98).

#### REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation four lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March

6, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; and

S. 739. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places."

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 839. A bill for the relief of Etta Houser Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. REED introduced Senate bill 840, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 841. A bill for the relief of J. P. Woolsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 842. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 843. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 844. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide a minimum annuity of \$50 per month for annuitants who have completed 30 years service; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 845. A bill to define the exterior boundaries of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 846. A bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 847. A bill to provide for certain payments to needy blind individuals;

S. 848. A bill to provide for certain payments to dependent children;

S. 849. A bill to extend provisions of the act of March 20, 1933, and veterans' regulations applicable to World War veterans and dependents to veterans and dependents of the present war, and for other purposes; and

S. 850. A bill to provide for the payment of old-age pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 851. A bill to provide adequate aeronautical training for the youth of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 852. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fortified facility at or near the naval depot at Hawthorne, Nev.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 853. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 854. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 855. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for an



annuity for total and permanent disability after 10 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 856. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Henry I. Brown; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### APPEALS FROM PRICE-CONTROL ORDERS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes. This is not a farm-bloc bill. This is not in the interest of or of any benefit to the farmer. It is a bill in the interest of the consumer whose supply of food, especially meat, is being threatened by impossible orders issued by the O. P. A., in violation of the plain intent of Congress.

The original Price Control Act of 1942 set up an emergency court of appeals and gave it exclusive jurisdiction over all appeals from orders and regulations of the O. P. A. The difficulty is that policies and practices of the O. P. A. makes appeal almost impossible under existing law. Appeal may be delayed by amendment and change in the orders and regulations, or by requiring additional information before an order is made final. In spite of great dissatisfaction with the many orders of the O. P. A., not a single appeal, so far as my information goes, has been able to reach the emergency court.

This bill provides appeal to any district court having jurisdiction of the parties.

The bill (S. 840) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN DISABLED PERSONS—BILL RECOMMENDED

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 48, Senate bill 180, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise, may be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor, together with all amendments which may be pending or on the table relating thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill and amendments will be rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2068) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him as an amendment to the committee amendment to the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agri-

cultural occupations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. McKELLAR) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following:

"Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services: For payments to States for expenditure in accordance with State plans for the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers, approved by the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, upon recommendation of the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, or Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for payments to subdivisions of States for expenditure in accordance with such plans, such payments to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with certification to him by any office of the Government designated for such purpose by the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, fiscal year 1943, \$2,884,000: *Provided*, That any plan so approved shall itemize by classes and amounts the total funds required for the plan and the amount of Federal funds requested; shall provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the efficient operation of the plan; shall set out a schedule of fees to be charged; shall state the extent of State and local participation in providing necessary funds, facilities, and services; shall provide for the inclusion and financing of any projects for care of children of employed mothers, now financed in whole or in part from Federal funds, upon the expiration of existing Federal grants, when such projects are essential to the prosecution of the war; and the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services shall not approve any plan except upon his determination that the schedule of fees is the maximum practicable in view of the wages paid in the areas served, and his determination that the State and local participation is adequate in view of the financial status of the State or subdivisions: *Provided further*, That payments shall not exceed 50 percent of the total estimated expenditures, including expenditures from fees received, but excluding expenditures for purchase, renovation, construction, repair, or equipment of any building or premises in excess of \$1,000 for each project: *Provided further*, That no payment from this appropriation shall be available for the purchase or erection of buildings; for alteration, repair, and equipment for any single project in excess of \$1,000; or for operating expense, alteration, repairs, or equipment except in areas with special needs because of substantial increase in employment of women arising out of the war: *Provided further*, That the term "States" as used herein shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii: *Provided further*, That any equipment which is under the control of the Federal Works Agency and which is necessary to a project for the care of children of employed mothers already in operation and in use at the time such project is placed under this program may be transferred for the purposes hereof to other Federal agencies as the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services may prescribe, and the appraised value thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, and other Federal agencies upon transfer thereto in accordance herewith, in connection with the foregoing approval of plans and payments to States, including personal services in the District of Columbia; actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, without other compensation from the United States, while away from their homes in an advisory capacity to the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services; and printing and binding; fiscal year 1943, \$89,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100."

Page 6, after line 1, insert the following:

#### "BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION

"Notwithstanding the limitations in section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, the appropriation for the Board of Investigation and Research contained in said act shall be available for travel expenses and printing and binding in amounts not exceeding \$11,000 and \$23,000, respectively."

Page 8, after line 24, insert the following:

"Emergency preparation of high-school students for wartime service, Office of Education (national defense): For payments to States through certification from time to time by the United States Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of each State to which payment is to be made and the amount to be paid, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the President, such payments to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, as follows:

"(1) For assistance to the States in adjusting the organization and curriculum of the high schools to a program for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service, such assistance to consist of (1) medical examination of students, and (2) the improvement of teachers in service in the fields of physical education, aeronautics, science, and mathematics through local district teacher-training institutes, demonstrations, visitations, publication, and other means; as provided by State departments of education pursuant to plans submitted by them and approved by the Commissioner, fiscal year 1943, \$2,390,000: *Provided*, That each State department and local board of education shall continue to expend, on an annual basis, such sums as it has spent therefor in the year preceding the enactment hereof.

"(2) For assistance to State departments of education in providing State administration and instructional services in adjusting the organization and curriculum of the high schools to a program for the preparation of youth for wartime service, such administrative and instructional services to include salaries of State directors of a High School Victory Corps, of supervisors of physical fitness, aeronautics, mathematics, science, and occupational information and war service counseling, and of clerical and stenographic services; necessary travel expenses; and printing; in accordance with plans submitted by State departments of education and approved by the Commissioner, fiscal year 1943, \$678,000: *Provided*, That the State departments of education shall continue to expend for such purposes, on an annual basis, such amounts from State funds as were available therefore in the year preceding the enactment hereof.

"Salaries and expenses, emergency preparation of high-school students for wartime

service, Office of Education (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out the foregoing program for the emergency preparation of high-school students for wartime service, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, printing and binding, not to exceed \$7,500 for the payment of actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner, fiscal year 1943, \$114,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner shall transmit to Congress within 30 days after the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, a report of the emergency program for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service as provided for in this act, such report to show the distribution of Federal funds by States, types of expenditures, and numbers of persons involved."

Page 21, after line 9, insert the following:

"CHILDREN'S BUREAU

"Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care: For grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades, under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, fiscal year 1943, \$1,200,000."

Page 25, line 24, after the figure "\$491,000", insert the following: "": *Provided*, That cost of living and representation allowances, as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931, as amended, may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed hereunder."

Page 28, after line 8, insert the following:

"Special melting and coinage: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to further the war effort by authorizing the substitution of other materials for strategic metals used in minor coinage, to authorize the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars, and for other purposes", approved December 18, 1942 (Public Law 815), the expenses or adjustments in connection with the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars shall be charged against the gain arising from the coinage of such bars."

Mr. HAYDEN also (for Mr. McKellar) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. McKellar to House bill 1975, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1943, which were severally referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

MULTIPLE SHIP LAUNCHINGS IN  
SUPERIOR, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a group of workers in the shipyards of Superior, Wis., stating that on May 9 they would launch from five to eight ships. The letter states that this will be a world record for multiple launchings. It is expected that the Dionne quintuplets will be present, and the Lakes Ship Builders Joint Council is preparing for a great celebration. I ask that the letter

of the head of the Lakes Ship Builders Joint Council, together with my reply, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAD OF THE LAKES  
SHIPBUILDERS JOINT COUNCIL,  
Superior, Wis., March 4, 1943.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Local shipyards in Superior will launch from five to eight ships on May 9. This should achieve a world record for multiple launchings in one port on one day. To celebrate this event, the Dionne quintuplets will make their first visit to the United States in order to sponsor five sister ships in a "quint" launching at the Butler yards, and the local Shipbuilders Council, representing union labor, has declared that May 9 will be Labor Victory Day.

It is the hope of our committee that Labor Victory Day will commemorate a real day of victory in the battle of production, and a day of which laboring men everywhere will be proud. In the past labor has received some unpleasant publicity, but on this day, it is our hope, labor will receive some recognition of its cooperation with management. Here in Superior, for example, there has not been one strike, nor one work stoppage in our entire shipbuilding war effort. As a consequence, our shipyards are far ahead of production schedules, and, in addition, the shipbuilding unions have established an enviable record in the purchase of war bonds.

To make Labor Victory Day amount to something more than just another name-observance day, to give it some tangible expression, all shipbuilding employees will donate one full day's wages into a fund for the purchase of a shipload of food for war-stricken Europe. We estimate that this fund should approximate \$50,000, and it is our hope that one of the "quint" ships may be secured to carry this cargo, thus underlining the fact that the supplies are from the workmen of Superior to the starving families of oppressed workmen in Europe. In this connection we have a real need for your support.

In general, we would appreciate any publicity which you may be able to give our enterprise. In particular, we would like you to approach the national headquarters of the International Red Cross on our behalf. Will you kindly advise us of their attitude? Finally, though we are willing to turn the whole problem of transportation over to the Red Cross, we definitely feel that local community support would be stronger, and the publicity value greater, if we could secure one of the "quint" ships. These freighters from the Butler yards happen to be earmarked under lend-lease for Great Britain. After consultation with the Red Cross, we would appreciate your contacting the British lend-lease officials, the American State Department, or any responsible parties who would be in a position to give us an opinion on the feasibility of this plan.

Though we realize that this is asking you to do a great deal, we believe that you will agree it is for a worthy cause, and we assure you of our genuine appreciation for anything you may do for us.

Respectfully yours,

HOLDER MODEEN,  
Chairman, Superior Shipbuilders Council.

MARCH 8, 1943.

MAJ. RALPH W. OLMSTEAD,  
Deputy Director, Food Distribution  
Administration,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR OLMSTEAD: Pursuant to our telephone conversation I am attaching herewith a self-explanatory letter which I received this morning from the Superior Ship-

builders Council, 1005 Tower Avenue, Superior, Wis.

You will recall I discussed this matter with you in a telephone conversation and you assured me the matter could be arranged in accordance with the request outlined in this letter.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson and also to Lease-Lend Administrator E. R. Stettinius, and War Shipping Administrator E. S. Land.

As I understand it from my telephone conversation with you, it will not be necessary for these men to take any action since your department can handle the matter in its entirety. I am, however, sending them copies of the letter from the Superior Shipbuilders Council together with this letter so they may be fully advised in the event you may have to call on them for cooperation.

I regard this matter as extremely urgent, and I would greatly appreciate having a reply by telephone as soon as you can give me definite information or assurance these plans can be carried out.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

SLOGAN AGAINST ABSENTEEISM BY MISS  
CAROL GRAGG

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Cessna Aircraft Co., of Wichita, Kans., has been doing an excellent job of production in the war effort. I am informed that its campaign to reduce absenteeism has been attended with remarkably successful results.

As a part of its campaign against absenteeism, the Cessna plant held a contest for the best slogan. More than 1,000 slogans were entered. The winner of the contest was Miss Carol Gragg, a war worker in the electrical department of the plant. The splendid original slogan she suggested is this:

"You can't spell victory with an absent-T."

I think the slogan is pat, to a Tee, as we used to say. I am glad to call the attention of the Senate to Miss Carol Gragg, of the Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans., and hope that her slogan, "You can't spell victory with an absent-T" does its bit toward victory.

GOVERNMENT BY REGIMENTATION AND  
BUREAUCRACY—ARTICLE BY WALTER  
E. CHRISTENSON

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 25, I addressed the Senate relative to a nomination the confirmation of which was resisted by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

In my remarks I stated that those of us who came from Nebraska came on a mandate from the people that we should cooperate with the President in the war effort 100 percent, but also that we should oppose to the utmost a government by regimentation and bureaucracy. As I said at that time, this mandate was given to us in no uncertain terms, and in the brief remarks I made to the Senate I called attention to my belief in the fundamental principles of representative government. I advised that these principles were reflected by the people of my State, and that it has been my experience that they extend quite generally into the other Midwestern States.

Since then an article has been written by Walter E. Christenson, an associate



editor of the Omaha World Herald, which sets forth in forceful and dramatic language the ideology of government of our Nebraska people and, I would say, of the voters of the Middle West.

I ask unanimous consent that this splendid article by Mr. Christenson be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECAY OF LIBERALISM—THE CITIZEN VERSUS EXECUTIVE DECREE

(By W. E. Christenson)

To some people liberalism means Eugene Debs; to some it means George Norris; to some it means Joe Stalin; and to some it means Franklin Roosevelt.

To me it doesn't mean any of those, but it means a lot of people who, through the ages, have been leading the fight for the liberty of human beings—and particularly those who have been fighting against enslavement of people by their government.

It's nothing new. Dionysius said, "A love of liberty is implanted by nature in the breasts of all men." Tacitus wrote, "Liberties and masters are not easily combined." Thirteen centuries later William Wallace said to the Scots, "I tell you true liberty is the best of all things; never live beneath the noose of a servile halter."

But while this feeling for liberty appears to be almost universal, it flourishes more luxuriantly on American soil than anywhere else on the globe. The reasons are not obscure. From the earliest settlements our country has been populated and repopulated by fugitives from tyranny. And when the time came for separation, it is noteworthy, I believe, that the colonists in their bill of complaint did not dwell on physical hardships. They did not say, "You have not protected us from the Indians," or "You have not taken care of our old people," or "You haven't allowed us to have enough tea." The thing that caused them to rebel was that they were being treated as inferiors and dependents. They were revolting against the usurpations of the king and the violations of their liberties.

"He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary \* \* \* He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly \* \* \* He has made judges dependent on his will alone \* \* \* He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance \* \* \* He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution \* \* \*

The colonists were fighting, not the particular brain trust which happened to be in power in London at that moment, but a totalitarian system.

ECONOMIC DESPOTISM OUR NEW TYRANNY

The war against the mother country was won, but the battle for human liberty did not end. It continued until our own times.

But when the decades arrived which most of us look back upon as the days of our youth—the decades which marked the turn of the twentieth century—the nature of the battle had changed. Political authoritarianism had been vanquished, we thought, for all time. But in its place there had come a sort of economic despotism which many free Americans found no less galling than earlier types of tyranny. The natural wealth of the land had been plundered to a considerable extent by the robber barons who flourished after the Civil War. Great wealth and great economic power became concentrated in a few hands. Workers in great industrial centers were ground down into a state of ser-

vility. The historical avenue of escape—flight to the west—narrowed and finally closed as the cheap land was occupied.

That was when modern liberalism was born.

Most westerners were liberals in those days. We were the sons of wild jackasses, we had the breath of freedom in our nostrils, and we didn't want to see ourselves or our children shackled into an industrial class system of society. We wanted to live in a republic in which there was real opportunity for all—economic opportunity as well as political opportunity. We wanted every child, even if born in the humblest home, to have a chance to become a congressman or a president or a chairman of the board—according to the stuff there was in him.

Our thoughts in those days were largely concerned with what we called the trusts and the malefactors of great wealth; with swindlers who impudently sold worthless stocks; with manipulators who threw great railroad systems into bankruptcy so that they might plunder them; with sweatshops and company stores and kick-backs and black-lists and insolently juggled tariffs and adulterated food and short weight and all the other manifold evils that had attached themselves to the economic and political system.

WE DID NOT TIRE OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY

But let this point be made—to borrow a phrase—"again and again." Most of us were not tired of individual liberty; we wanted more of it. We wanted the rules of living in a free land to be changed a little so that we, the people, would be more secure in our freedom and less endangered by the irresponsible authority of autocrats.

It is only fair to say that there were crack-pots in the liberal movement—socialists, anarchists, syndicalists and "ists" of many stripes who even then were thinking in terms of a dictatorship of the proletariat. But they were an insignificant minority. The great American liberal movement was libertarian in its aims and constitutional in its methods. Nothing was further from its purpose than a return to the days when bureaucrats swarmed over the land, eating the substance of the people.

Ten years ago American liberalism thought it had won its greatest political victory. But as time was to prove, that was in reality its hour of greatest danger.

For the men and women who crowded into places of power in the next decade were not in every case believers in the traditional American concept of liberty. They were not in every case well grounded in the practical mechanics of modern society. There were experimenters in their ranks, and uplifters and social workers and dreamy-eyed doers of good—and a few zealots who had borrowed their ideas from other climes and non-American cultures.

"Liberalism," so-called, was in the saddle, but it was not the pure, historical American liberalism. In too many instances it had overtones of the other kinds of isms then being advocated in Europe.

OVER-ALL TREND TOWARD ARBITRARY AUTHORITY

The strange thing about this new, left-wing, self-styled liberalism was that it proposed to set up bureaucratic government controls, backed by executive directives, to preserve the liberties of the people. The founding fathers would have turned in their sacred graves if they had heard such heresy.

Perhaps the harassed businessman when he accepted the temporary shelter of the National Recovery Act, the farmer when he took a Federal check for what he had raised or had not raised, the humble Work Projects Administration worker when he thanked Washington for his pittance, did not have time to think about the fundamental conflict involved. But the conflict was there, as clearly etched as ever it had been in his-

tory: The Taxpayer versus the Bureaucrat, the Citizen versus the Executive Decree.

This is not an indictment of an administration. It should be said in fairness that many items in the program of the New Deal were beneficial changes in the rules—changes designed to permit the average American a chance to lead a better and more useful and freer life.

But the over-all trend of the decade has been toward strengthening the arbitrary authority of the State. The power of the courts has been assailed and the power of the Congress has been usurped and bypassed. Today no prudent attorney would dare to advise a client on any matter relating to the economic life of the Nation merely on the basis of what he could find in the statutes or in his volumes of judicial opinions. More important by far than these are the decrees and directives which come from the bureaucracy, and the rulings thereon which have been handed down by various ones of 2,500,000 civil employees of the Central Government.

THEIR GOAL SECURITY BUT NOT LIBERTY

It is argued that a vast extension in the authority of the Government is necessary in time of war to make the Nation more efficient and more productive. On that point we should be particularly careful to think clearly.

The American people do not object to the discipline demanded by total war or to the so-called hardships which result for the civilian population. A temporary lack of gasoline or rubber or shoes or coffee or whatever is trivial incident in the life of a Nation. But the kind of government that may result from these strictly temporary conditions—that is a matter of the deepest interest to all of us and to our children. What is happening today should be viewed in the light of what has gone before and what is promised for the future. And that view is not entirely reassuring.

These former liberal brethren who are now in authority in Washington had charted their course long before total war had imposed its demands upon the Nation. They had said in substance: "Our goal is security. Not liberty, but security. We are going to see to it that everyone, the shirker equally with the toiler, has plenty to eat and a comfortable place in which to live. It is not our purpose merely to create a society in which all will have a fair chance to produce and earn. We propose to take charge of society, we propose to direct its economic operations in such a way that the social objectives which we in our wisdom deem proper shall be guaranteed to every citizen by the central authority."

And if the voice of Benjamin Franklin cried from the tomb: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety"—if that voice was raised, surely no one in all the land heard.

THE ROAD FRANCE TROD

We moderns have a tragic illustration before us of what may happen if the search for national leisure and security—under the auspices of a bureaucracy—is carried to an extreme. In his report on the reasons for the fall of France, General Giraud, our present aide and ally, spoke realistically of conditions within that country before the war. He said:

"It was easier to succeed by intrigue than work. Politics became a career of compromise, arrangement, betrayal. Many lawyers, professors, and journalists suddenly believed themselves statesmen, as soon as they had taken their first degree—but above all, as soon as they had managed to get into the office of some undersecretary of state, or into the reception room of some woman of importance.

"From 1918 to 1940 France luxuriated in every kind of regime that might be called

republican—from horizon blue to the Red popular front. Ministries fell like houses of cards, scandals accumulated, riots caused the spilling of French blood even on the paving stones of the capital; but always the same men trod the boards. The ruin which the popular front caused France is immeasurable, but its greatest responsibility was to teach the people of France laziness under the grandiose name of leisure."

In a similar report, issued sometime before France was destroyed, two Premiers of that Republic—the Messrs. Daladier and Reynaud—expressed similar sentiments. They said:

"Actually that part of the French population which created wealth, which labors for the future, is continually diminishing, while that part which, directly or indirectly, lives on the state is constantly growing. \* \* \* There is a steady fall in the number of Frenchmen who are ready to bear the risks of enterprise and creation. \* \* \* That everyone should work more and that the state should spend less—for ourselves we see this as the only formula of salvation; it is elementary, but it is inescapable."

#### WE MUST BRAVE SOME EPITHETS

And at another point this report continues:

"The problem, then, is not to choose between preserving or repealing the recent social reforms, whose generous inspiration nobody disputes. The problem is to prevent them from automatically dwindling to nothing, to prevent their benefits from evaporating in the high cost of living, to prevent employers and employed, in a country which is still poor, from having nothing to share but poverty."

They were writing about France, but their message was for America, too.

It is a little difficult to discuss such matters without seeming to defend some of the piratical practices which attached themselves to our economy during the earlier years of easy prosperity. The one who questions steps taken since 1933 is likely to be answered with, "Oh, so you prefer the Hoover depression." The one who questions the all-seeing, all-knowing wisdom of the bureaucracy is likely to be branded as a tory and a latter-day edition of Mark Hanna. Yet those taunts will have to be braved if we are going to save the kind of personal liberty Americans love.

Only the naive will expect that the law-making and directive-issuing bureaucracy will meekly disband after the war and that its many practitioners will return forthwith to their studies and their social service settlements. So far as I am aware no such miracle has ever transpired in the long record of the struggle between the people and government. Rousseau was speaking for history when he said: "Liberty is never recovered if it is once lost."

#### "PLANNING" IS NEW WORD FOR DESPOTISM

There are plentiful signs that those former liberals who now are directing the managed economy do not propose to go against the tide of history. They propose, when victory is won, that "planning"—that new word for despotism—shall be carried to new heights.

Only a few weeks ago HENRY A. WALLACE, that most lovable and most amazing of all planners, gave a glimpse of what is running through his mind. In the post-war world, he said, there will be a new type of government which might be called, "the democracy of the common man." And this new democracy, he said, will be made up of approximately equal parts of our traditional (it is his phrase) "Bill of Rights democracy" and the newer—again quoting Mr. WALLACE—"economic democracy" as exemplified in the Government of Soviet Russia.

If economic democracy fits the needs of Russia—whose history and traditions are far

different from our own—then certainly no one in America should utter one word of criticism. Americans have reason to be eternally grateful for the stout Red Army which that economic democracy has produced. But does that mean that we, also, should adopt the democracy of the commissars and the collective farms? That we should consider borrowing for our own use any part of a type of regime whose final authority is based upon the firing squad? Perhaps some Americans will not agree with their Vice President.

Another post-war dreamer who is not an official but who sometimes speaks for the prevailing attitude in Washington, said only a few days ago: "Soviet Russia is now functioning as a complete democracy within an over-all totalitarian scheme."

Possibly as you think it over you may conclude that is a fair statement of the program which some of these totalitarian-minded citizens may have in view.

Any talk about what those now in authority propose in the way of a post-war program for our own country—I am not now speaking of any international organization—must necessarily be speculative. No one has stated it formally. We can only see what is happening, read what is being said—and then use our God-given intelligence.

Perhaps that points to one of the greatest dangers of the times. We are not fighting a tangible program which can be faced and debated, but only an insidious trend. Trends are mighty tricky things to fight, as the people of Germany discovered in 1933.

This would be a grand hour for the old-time, fighting American liberals—if they were still on the scene. But unfortunately the movement in which they once joined is bankrupt. Some of its leaders have been shanghaied and taken on a political cruise which was never charted. Others are tired and dejected. The political power which they built up has been dissipated or subverted to opposite uses. The great American liberal movement which once spread its beneficent influence over both great parties has disappeared.

True, there are political leaders in both parties who take a strong stand agin' what is being done. But if they should be put in power, would they be strong enough morally to junk the enormously powerful and (to the driver) attractive governmental machine that has been created? Historically a mere policy of throwing the rascals out has never been entirely successful.

A demand from a few political leaders can be forgotten after the election; a demand from the American people can never be ignored. The thing that is needed is to bring about a reawakening of embattled American liberalism so that the people themselves will insist upon and get a restoration of the kind of liberty that made America great.

If we, the people, don't resist, day by day, the insinuating power of the Government directive, the time may come in America when every lawyer will work for the bureaucracy and every newspaperman will get his copy from the ministry of propaganda, and every citizen will get his marching orders from Washington.

If that time should ever come, it will not be because, to borrow another phrase, anyone "planned it that way" but because we, the liberty-loving people, were too complacent—because we didn't start fighting in time.

#### PROPOSED RESTRICTION OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received a most illuminating letter from Mr. A. Warren Norton, manager of the Christian Science Monitor, regarding the proposed restriction of newsprint. This letter is such a valuable contribution to this subject that I ask that it be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

#### PUBLISHING SOCIETY,

Boston, Mass., March 5, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LODGE: I am glad to learn from your recent letter that you are endeavoring to keep in close touch with the newsprint situation as it seems to be developing in Washington, for there is no doubt but what it has far-reaching implications.

It would seem that the freedoms which were fought for and became the basis of this Republic are continually being encroached upon. There is no doubt but that if we wish to retain our freedom we must never give up freedom of the press and must in every turn overcome any encroachments upon it, regardless of the directions from which they come.

Freedom of the press without newsprint would obviously vanish. Any unnecessary restrictions upon its supply does, without a doubt, restrict the dissemination of the news to a public which should always be fully informed. Your job and mine is to see to it that no one at any time does anything to keep our great Nation from being informed.

I would like to say, and unselfishly, too, that sacrifices in the use of paper should be made in other lines first rather than with newsprint; where the use of paper is not strictly for war or military purposes.

We have all seen how through radio licensing restrictions may be placed, or could be placed, upon the radio stations of the country to the extent that they really do not enjoy the same freedom that the newspapers of the country now have.

I might direct your attention to the point that newspapers need advertising to offset a large part of the expenses involved in publication. This being the case, any restrictions in newsprint must reduce the size of newspapers thus limiting, and in a measure reducing the amount of money available, not only to print, but to gather news so that the public may be informed.

As I see it, there is a further danger that throughout the country there are many small newspapers, their size may already be small in number of pages, which would be harmed by a too drastic cut in the use of newsprint. In other words, with a large number of pages, a newspaper could easily cut 10, 20, or even 50 percent and wind up with, let us say, 18 or 20 pages which under normal conditions might be sufficient for news purposes. However, a publication starting out with the same number of pages, the reductions being up to 50 percent, would force many newspapers out of business.

Let us also not penalize those publishers who by virtue of their foresight protected themselves from such a war emergency as we now find ourselves in, and those newsprint manufacturers who also contemplated the same restrictions and foresaw the need of following a pattern which was not apprehended by others at that time.

There are perhaps many other things I could think of but possibly the above will be helpful. To be invincible we must be informed.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

A. WARREN NORTON,  
Manager.

FARM SECURITY, NATIONAL SECURITY,  
AND POST-WAR PLANNING—ADDRESS  
BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Farm Security, National



Security, and Post-War Planning," delivered by the Vice President before a meeting of farmers and representatives of civic organizations, Columbus, Ohio, March 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LET US DEFEND THE AMERICAN HOME— ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Let Us Defend the American Home," delivered by him on March 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WAR GUILT AND PUNISHMENT FOR WAR CRIMES — ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article having to do with war guilt and punishment for crimes against humanity, written by him, published in the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PLANTING THE VICTORY GARDEN— ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Planting the Victory Garden," delivered by Senator LUCAS at a banquet of the Catholic Charities of Rockford, Ill., on March 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TASKS OF CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator MURRAY relating to the tasks facing Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE AT CONVOCATION OF UNIVER- SITY OF TORONTO

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the convocation of the University of Toronto, Toronto Canada, February 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRADE AGREEMENTS IN A NEW WORLD— ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Trade Agreements in a New World," by Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, published in the Atlantic Monthly for March 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on rural electrification delivered by Hon. George W. Norris, of Nebraska, at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association meeting at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WASHINGTON DINNER ADDRESS BY AMBROSE O'CONNELL

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Ambrose O'Connell, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the George Washington dinner, March 6, 1943, at Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### BOUNDARIES OF SMALLER NATIONS— ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning the boundaries of smaller nations written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of March 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SECRECY IN DIPLOMACY—ADDRESS BY HUGH M. GRANT

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles Pennington embodying an address delivered by Dr. Hugh G. Grant, former United States Minister to Albania, in Chattanooga, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM HOWARD D. GREGG

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Howard D. Gregg, president of the State College for Colored Students at Dover, Del., advocating continuance of the National Youth Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### VOLUNTARY EMPLOYMENT—EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD (CONN.) COURANT

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Keep Employment Voluntary," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of March 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REVIEW OF NATIONAL DAIRY SITUATION

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review of the national dairy situation issued by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation under date of March 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE MOST DESPICABLE SABOTEUR—EDI- TORIAL FROM FORT WAYNE (IND.) NEWS-SENTINEL

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Despicable Saboteur" published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of March 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINE FROM TEXAS TO INDIANA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 103) to investigate certain matters in connection with the proposed construction of an additional pipe line from Texas to Indiana, submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (and other Senators) on February 15, 1943.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HOSPITALIZATION, DOMICILIARY CARE, AND BURIAL BENEFITS IN CERTAIN WORLD WAR NO. 2 CASES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 1749) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 96) thereon. The bill is known as the act granting hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War No. 2 cases.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 73, Senate bill 230, a companion bill to the

bill which I have just reported from the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 230) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to certain World War No. 2 cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the Senator had asked unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator made a motion. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 230) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to certain World War No. 2 cases, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "following" and the colon, to strike out "Any officer, enlisted man, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of the present war," and to insert: "World War No. 2—Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term 'active military or naval service', as used herein, shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "World War No. 2—Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term 'active military or naval service', as used herein, shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, House bill 1749 was passed by the House of Representatives unanimously, has been considered at length by the veterans' subcommittee of the Committee on Finance and unanimously reported by that subcommittee to the full committee, and unanimously reported by the full committee to the Senate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend to veterans who are now being discharged, who may have suffered disability, and who have become veterans of World War No. 2, the same opportunity for hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits as those which have hitherto been granted to veterans of World War No. 1.

Mr. President, it is an emergency matter for the reason that there are many men now being discharged from the armed forces after service in World War No. 2 as to whose status in veterans' hospitals, under the present law, there is some doubt. As a result thereof, men are being discharged—and this is particularly true of mental cases and tuberculosis cases—from the armed forces, and their families are being notified to come and get them; that they are not entitled under the present law to hospitalization in veterans' hospitals. Many men have been sent to State insane asylums, or efforts have been made to place them in State insane asylums, but the State authorities have been reluctant to take them, on the ground that this is purely a Federal obligation. I am ashamed to say, Mr. President, that in a considerable number of cases, particularly mental cases, the families of the men have been unable to take care of them, the State institutions have been unwilling to receive them, and so the men themselves, after being discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States, have actually been confined in common jails, through no other fault of their own than that they had suffered serious mental derangement, in many cases as the direct result of their service in the armed forces of the United States.

So, by the proposed legislation it is our purpose simply to do now at the outset of the emergency the same thing that was done 5½ years after the last war, and which has been the policy of the United States Government ever since as to veterans of World War No. 1. I say it would be a disgrace to the United States to permit this situation to continue.

Mr. President, in fairness I should say that the Veterans' Bureau proposed an amendment which would require the disabilities to have been noted in the service. Neither the Veterans' Subcommittee nor the full House committee, nor the Finance Committee of the Senate were willing to accept such an amendment for the reason that under the present law and regulations, which are simply extended to the veterans of World War No. 2, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has the power and the right and the duty, by regulation, to prescribe priorities in acceptances into hospitals and the extension of the facilities of the hospitals, so, under the proper regulations prescribed by the Veterans' Bureau, there is no danger of a man coming home with flat feet and crowding out mental cases or tubercular cases, or men who are bitterly and urgently in need of hospitalization.

Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment may be adopted. It provides simply for the status of the WAAC's, the WAVES, the SPARS, and members of other organizations, entitling them to

hospitalization, but not to any pecuniary benefits.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to Senate bill 230.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to substitute for the Senate bill, House bill 1749, which has just been favorably reported with an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1749) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, which had been reported from the Finance Committee, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "World War II—Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term 'active military or naval service,' as used herein, shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the committee amendment to the House bill strikes out all after the enacting clause, and substitutes therefor the language of the Senate bill, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1749) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War II cases."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 230 will be indefinitely postponed.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to occupy a few minutes of the time of the Senate, and for the sake of continuity I ask the privilege of not being interrupted until I shall have finished my remarks at which time I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. President, America is engaged today in the greatest war effort in its entire history, an effort which will tax the human, and the material, as well as the spiritual resources of a hundred and thirty-five million people to a greater

extent than ever before. The restrictions and restraints, the sufferings and the sorrows of a global war are not only apparent but are becoming very real.

This war touches every shore, encompasses every sky, and takes in every body of water on the face of the earth. We are in to win, we must win, we will win, and America and its entire citizenry are willing to make every necessary sacrifice to that end.

But the question constantly arising in loyal American minds is how a free people can best utilize their form of government, their manpower, and their resources to win in a global war.

War is the most costly and devastating activity of man, and there must be a definite purpose for which men are willing to make supreme sacrifices. Our liberty, our right to be free was the result of a war. The purpose of that war was not entirely clear nor defined until there was a meeting of the minds resulting in the Declaration of Independence. With that defined determination, the armies of the colonies were united under one flag and victory was won. Out of victory came a government of written rules, of distributed authority, of divided powers made permanent by the writing and adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

Even the written Constitution was not satisfactory to the people who had made such great sacrifices for liberty. They demanded in addition what is commonly known as the Bill of Rights in which they enumerated the rights of the people. The first amendment provided as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Under this written form of government with guaranteed human rights, we have become outstanding among those nations of the earth where men of every nationality, creed, and color, have assembled and live in harmony. Now we must stand our greatest test, "trial by battle" on all the seas, in all the skies, and on the battle fronts of the entire world.

Early in this war, the President of the United States formulated two pronouncements as the laudable objectives for which our citizens are fighting and dying. First, the "four freedoms," and second, the Atlantic Charter.

There are some who fear that there are persons in this country, both in and outside our Government service, who would pull the flag of the Atlantic Charter so high that it would supersede our Constitution, and there are those who would elevate the banner of the "four freedoms" to such an extent that we would lose sight of our own Bill of Rights.

When we engage in war we engage to win. War follows the rule of necessity; we do the things that are necessary to win. The strategy of the war, the type and size of our Army, our Navy, and Air Corps, the type of weapons and their



number, are determined by the necessities of the hour and the turn of events, but we must be sure that in all this unprecedented war effort we follow the rules laid down in the Constitution and continue to guard the human protection provided for in our Bill of Rights.

It is significant that the founding fathers included in the rights to be demanded for the people the following language:

Congress shall make no law \* \* \* abridging the freedom of the press.

It can be truthfully said that the precious rights of individual men and the fundamental institution of our representative form of government have been fostered and defended by the free press of America more than by any other element of our national life, and that so long as we remain freemen and are individually willing to fight, to suffer, and to die to preserve a free form of government, we must recognize no emergency as being so great as to necessitate the destruction or unnecessary abridgement of the free press of America.

Recent orders and counterorders issued in connection with the amounts of paper to be used by newspapers arrest attention and cause concern regarding what seem to be related events going back over a number of years. Their character provokes inquiry and comment.

Approximately 10 years ago an attempt was made under the guise of national emergency to regulate all the industries of America. So-called codes of fair competition were drawn up for the various industries. But the bright minds who developed the codes of fair competition forgot to take into consideration that the press is one industry and the only industry that was guaranteed its freedom from abridgement by the Constitution of the United States. The Bill of Rights was never intended to guarantee the freedom of the press only for the benefit of the publisher. The importance of the guaranty was the people's right to have the publisher free for their protection and their benefit.

Notwithstanding the provision of protection of the press in the Bill of Rights, a code of fair competition was drawn up for the newspaper industry of America. Each publisher assenting to this code without reservation would have thereby waived his constitutional rights and would have submitted himself to the future regulations and arbitrary rulings of an administrator.

The newspapers of the country, which have always guarded the rights provided for the people, waged a successful fight to have inserted a saving clause in the code affecting newspapers, which read as follows:

Those submitting this code recognize that pursuant to section 10-B of the act, the President may from time to time cancel or modify any order approving this code but in submitting or subscribing to this code, the publishers do not thereby consent to any modification thereof, except as each may thereto subsequently agree, nor do they thereby waive any constitutional rights or

consent to the imposition of any requirements that might restrict or interfere with the constitutional guaranty of the freedom of the press.

The President declared that no one consenting to this code waived any constitutional rights, adding:

The recitation of the freedom of the press clause in the code has no more place than would the recitation of the whole Constitution or the Ten Commandments.

The publishers, however, insisted that if this added section made no modification, there should be no objection to its inclusion, and it was included.

It is well that it was included, for shortly thereafter the Attorney General, the appointed legal officer of the administration, included the following paragraph in his brief in the case of the United States against the Weirton Steel Co., as follows:

The defendant having applied for approval under the Recovery Act of a code of fair competition and having obtained the benefits accruing to it under the act, by reason of such approval, cannot attack the constitutionality of the provision of that code.

It is a well-settled rule in the Federal courts that—

One who has himself voluntarily invoked a statute, who has received the benefits flowing from a statute, is estopped to assert its unconstitutionality.

In other words, the Attorney General did contend that those who had accepted the code without reservation had waived their constitutional objections.

The predominant fear in the minds of the publishers of this country at that time was the fear of licensing by the Government of the press of America. It might be well to point out that at the time of the drafting of the Constitution and the adoption of the Bill of Rights, there were three agencies in this country which were predominant in the building of public opinion. They were the press, the public platform, and the pulpits of America. It is significant that the people insisted that all three be guaranteed freedom in the written Bill of Rights.

It might be well further to point out that at that time there were no motion pictures, and there was no radio. Both are now subject to licensing or regulation by the Government today.

It was the predominant fear of the publishers, confronted with this bureaucratically developed code, that there might be an insistence later on licensing the press of America.

We find some evidence later that would bear that out. Last spring when the Office of Defense Transportation issued its early orders restricting the use of rubber-tired vehicles for the very laudable purpose of saving rubber, no mention was made in those original orders of newspapers specifically. No recognition was given to their importance as an essential industry.

The drastic restrictions originally contemplated would have reduced the press of America to one edition a day, which would have resulted in putting many newspapers out of business.

After long periods of negotiation, modifications were adopted, resulting in a 40 percent reduction in the mileage of newspaper trucks.

Not only were the constitutional guaranties of the press overlooked, but their importance to the national welfare was likewise overlooked and ignored. It might be pointed out here that in our modern civilization, the right to distribute the news is a part of the right to print it.

The freedom of the press can be abridged in many ways, namely, by denying access to the news, denying the facilities to print, or denying the facilities to distribute the printed work to the people by unnecessary and arbitrary regulations, restrictions, or restraints.

This attitude of disregard for the rights of the press was repeated in November in the issuance of Office of Defense Transportation Order No. 21. Under this order, a certificate of war necessity was required for every commercial motor vehicle. Under its provisions, the Administrator had the power to designate the manner, the purpose, and the points between which each and every vehicle should be operated. He also had the power to force the lease or rental of one owner's truck to another person or corporation.

Under this order the foregoing powers were to be given to the Administrator— notwithstanding any contract, lease, or other commitment expressed or implied.

Again, in applying for certificates of war necessity under this order, the press of America was required to waive constitutional and legal rights under a provision whereby it agreed to surrender these certificates upon demand. With eternal vigilance, it insisted upon a paragraph as follows:

In filing the attached application for a certificate of war necessity the undersigned does not waive any constitutional rights or consent to the imposition of any requirements that might restrict or interfere with the constitutional guaranteed right of a newspaper publisher to distribute his publication.

Since that time there have been further curtailments and restrictions through the rationing of rubber, gasoline, metals, machinery, and other materials essential to the newspaper industry.

In the drafting of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, it was only after continued vigilance on the part of the press of America that exemptions from price fixing of advertising and circulation rates were obtained.

The interference on the part of the Government by the use of F. B. I. agents in visiting members of the Associated Press in an attempt to intimidate them and cause them to change their rules, and the subsequent suit brought by the Attorney General against the Associated Press, are continued evidence of harassment of the press by some men in the present administration.

Censorship of the press in time of war is most difficult, and at the same time most dangerous. In theory, it should be

used only to prevent valuable information from reaching the enemy. In practice, however, it can be used to keep bad news from reaching the American people, as was the case in the suppression of the facts regarding Pearl Harbor for a whole year after they were fully known to our enemies. Its use never should be tolerated to protect incompetence or to conceal mistakes and failures on the part of public servants. The press cannot discharge its duty to the public if censorship is wrongfully administered.

The action on the part of the Federal Communications Commission since 1941 in preventing a newspaper from securing a license to operate a radio station—not because the public would not be well served, but only because the applicant was a publisher of a newspaper—is indicative of a continued bias and hostility against the press of America.

From time to time, the W. P. B. has issued orders curtailing the use of many materials important to the production of newspapers, such as metals, machinery, inks, and so forth. The one material which forms the very life-blood of a newspaper is newsprint, or the paper upon which the news is printed and distributed to the people.

For more than 18 months, various bureaus and departments of the Government have threatened to issue orders restricting the use of newsprint to an extent varying from 10 to 70 percent. These threats have all been under the guise of war necessity, using the vaguest generalities in justification. Up to date, no genuine justification for these threatened curtailments has been made public.

The first order limiting the consumption of newsprint was issued by the W. P. B. effective January 1, 1943. It provided for an over-all reduction of approximately 10 percent. This the press accepted, although it questioned the necessity for such a reduction. Since then there have been various reports and conflicting suggestions of further curtailment. However, it was officially announced on February 9 that an order was soon to be issued, effective April 1, for a further curtailment of newsprint amounting to another 10 percent, and it was intimated that further curtailments might follow.

Through the continued vigilance of the press, aided by Members of the House of Representatives, a demand was made for the facts upon which this order was to be issued and proof of the necessity for any further cut.

The facts to prove that a further cut was necessary were not submitted, and on February 20, 10 days following the announcement by the Government that a further cut was absolutely necessary, it was officially announced that any further cut would be postponed indefinitely.

It is, of course, possible that this proposed curtailment was the unplanned result of the confusion which comes with the war effort. But it is fitting to inquire whether orders for a curtailment of use of paper by newspapers is a continuation of the harassment which has marked the present administration's atti-

titude toward newspapers, or is because of the necessities imposed by a national war economy.

What are the facts which demand the impairment of one of the most important contributors to our successful drive for victory over our enemies? Do our war needs truly require this reduction? Or is there some other plan behind this move—some animus or group which schemes by this device to strangle American newspapers?

The rescinding of the order only 10 days after it was announced is evidence of further hostility to the press and the desire by some people holding responsible positions in the Government to unnecessarily interfere with the proper and all-important functioning of the press of America.

While these threats were being made to seriously limit consumption of newsprint, the disclosure was made on the Senate floor by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] of the fabulous and extravagant use of paper to print the now famous magazine called "Victory," for the self-glorification of the present administration.

It was further disclosed by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] that the Government is using nearly 10 times as much paper today as it did in 1941.

I believe that a full disclosure of this increased use of paper by the Government would show a determined desire on the part of some men in our present Government to supplant the free press of our country by Government dominated "news," through the use of handouts from the various Government bureaus.

I believe that a full investigation of the publications issued by Government bureaus would show that enough paper is wasted to print all of the newspapers in a sizable percentage of the States of this entire Nation.

As we move on in this gigantic effort of global war, there will be constant demands for regulations and restrictions of every manner and kind, and the people will be looking constantly to their Representatives in Congress to protect them and the press through which they may be constantly advised and informed of every phase of our war effort.

In campaigns for enlistments, in scrap and salvage drives, in the sale of Government bonds and securities, in aiding the people concerning the details of rationing and restrictive orders, the press of America has contributed its full share to the magnificent war effort of our country.

This unprecedented service, presenting complete daily, visual coverage of national objectives, could not have been accomplished by any other medium or agency.

Today and in the future, the housewives of America will be determining the daily diet under the point system of rationing the food of our entire population through the aid of a page out of some newspaper hanging on the kitchen wall or on the cupboard door.

A newspaper is not a warship, a plane, a tank, or a battalion of infantry, but it serves in its field just as fittingly and importantly.

Modern war has spread from the land and the sea to a third dimension—the sky. It may also be said to have extended to a fourth dimension—the human mind. In the last-mentioned field of warfare there can be no more successful weapon than the newspaper. It carries the war to our enemies—not by explosive bomb or torpedo, but by the greater impact of concrete expressions of the ideals of truth and liberty.

In these times of national peril, the American people look rightfully to their Government for light and leadership. Reciprocally, a representative government in its own self-interest is impelled to seek contact with its citizens. Neither can exist in peace or in war without the other, and there is no channel of communication which is so mobile, so potent, and so mutually helpful as the newspapers of our country.

The newspaper has already had its valuable contributions to this Nation reduced by the shortages of rubber and the rationing of gasoline. We cannot stand by now and watch new handicaps unjustly imposed. We cannot tolerate those stupid minds which fancy they can do without the newspaper—or who want to bend it to their selfish purposes.

The destruction of the newspaper in Germany was one of the steps taken to put Hitler's gangsters into power. Without a strong, free press in the United States, the American people will be without one of their most vigorous protagonists, one which more than any other force, save perhaps this Congress, has remained true to the idea of American liberty.

Weaken the press, and the people will be without a means through which they can give fullest support to their Government in the grim fight ahead. On its side, the Government will be without one of its most potent means to achieve an early victory.

Congress shares today equal responsibility with the other branches of the Government in the successful prosecution of the war and in setting up means by which the civilian public may preserve the rights and liberties guaranteed them under the Constitution. We cannot abdicate. We cannot shrug off our responsibilities. The fate of this Republic is as much in our hands as it is in the hands of those bureaucrats who have been placed in official positions under the war powers granted by this body, but who are not directly answerable to the electorate of this Nation as we are. We cannot stand by trustingly in the assumption that the purposes for which we enacted legislation are the sole preoccupation of those who are active in carrying out administration of the laws. Experience has shown that we can place little confidence in the claims of certain individuals that the war wholly engrosses their attention and that the vast powers granted them are used solely to achieve victory over the Axis Powers.

The vital importance and essentiality of our American press increases as the shadows of this global war begin to lengthen. The importance and essentiality of our American press will grow as the rays of peace begin to dawn. It



will be doubly important that all our people be well informed by a free and alert press concerning the various proposals of suggested programs for the future peace of the world.

Congress has no greater responsibility than to assure the people that the press of this country will be protected and preserved in full vigor, and to notify the heads of the bureaus that we, the representatives of the people, will not tolerate any further unnecessary or arbitrary restrictive or restraining order that will cause the press of America to become either ineffective or impotent.

The newspapers of America stand in the shadow of no other group's patriotism. They have been marked for their loyalty and for their energy and devotion to the cause you and I serve. But there is a persistent effort to brand them as pariahs, to smear and assail them, to separate them from their Government and from the people they serve.

The movement should be seen for what it is. If there is malice, let us ascertain the reasons for it. If it comes as the clumsy result of inexperienced administrators, let that fact be known—what coterie, what clique, or what group of men constantly seek to impose these restrictions on America's first and last line of freedom.

The newspapers of America, I say, are ready to share in any deprivation required by the war; but prudence demands that we inquire whether through the instrumentality of war regulations the newspapers are being made the target of an attack by enemies of America—saboteurs who seek to destroy the newspapers and, through destroying them, to destroy one of the most treasured rights of American citizens.

When the Government established the recent base for the use of newsprint, they chose the amount used by the various newspapers in 1941 when the interests of the American people were concerned with wars between foreign nations. That base ignored the present interest and increased demands for news on the part of the American people when our own flesh and blood and our own country now are engaged in the death struggle of this global war.

We need but to turn our eyes toward the countries of our enemies to see what follows the destruction of a free press. We have only to remember the oppression of the peoples of other lands to know what comes as the result of Government control of newspapers by emergency regulations. Yes; we have only to read the history of our country to recall from what conditions our forefathers fled and why they surrounded the press with these constitutional guaranties.

Any step falsely taken which impairs the freedom and usefulness of newspapers is a perfidious act. Those who join any such conspiracy are enemies of this Republic and active supporters of those alien philosophies against which the whole military and civilian power of this country is now being mustered and marshaled.

Attempts to hamstring newspapers strike at the very principles on which this country was founded. Our forefathers foresaw the double importance of a free press as an inalienable right of the people and as a dynamic force in promulgating the ideals and idea of liberty. If they did not, why would they have given it such singular mention in that great document under which this country has risen to a state which is the inspiration of—yes, the hope of the world today?

Let me review and summarize: First, the attempt to limit the press under N. R. A.; then the hostile attitude of the Federal Communications Commission; the tactics used by the F. B. I., and the subsequent suit against the Associated Press by the Department of Justice; the restrictions placed in the original draft of the Price Control Act and in the Office of Defense Transportation orders; the arbitrary censorship of the news and orders from the Office of War Information; the rationing of rubber, gasoline, metals, and other materials; then the 10-percent cut of newsprint, and the subsequent trend to cut the use of newsprint by 10 percent in addition, which threatened order was withdrawn when a demand for a justification was made; the failure of the War Manpower Commission to declare the press of the Nation as one of our essential industries. Here is the evidence of the progression of a restrictive hand reaching out to limit and curtail the one instrument of information that was guaranteed its freedom in the Constitution under which we live. Each restrictive step shrewdly progressed under the cover of some ascribed emergency, but always short of a showdown, and always with a passing, soothing assurance of "only this, and nothing more."

The newspaper is the voice of freedom. The great minds which built a refuge and bastion for freemen in the United States perceived the necessity of keeping the press free, and they took steps to implement that freedom. Are we to permit the use of sly, indirect methods through which the press is now to be brought finally under control?

The fact that we are in a global war magnifies rather than minimizes the importance of the press of this country.

As we move deeper and deeper into this global war, our people are looking with increasing anxiety and interest for the unadulterated news of each day to be brought to them by a press free from unnecessary and vicious bureaucratic, efficiency-destroying restrictions. Yes, Mr. President; the people of America are looking to the Congress, their elected officials and representatives, to protect their precious, priceless right to be served as freemen by the free press of America.

#### LEND-LEASE MATERIALS FURNISHED TO RUSSIA

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Revercomb
Billbo	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Scruggs
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lodge	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Maybank	Wherry
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	
George	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALGREEN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] requested that announcement be made that he is necessarily absent today attending the last surviving forum of pure democracy in the United States, the annual New England town meeting in his home town of Temple, N. H.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the country was no doubt astounded to read in this morning's newspapers reports as to what Admiral Standley, our Ambassador at Moscow, is reported to have said with respect to the failure of the Russian people to receive information regarding the aid which the United States has been giving to Russia during the course of the present war.

Mr. President, there is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations a bill to extend the operations of the lend-lease law for 1 year. It is expected that tomorrow the Committee on Foreign Relations will give consideration to the extension of that act. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of

Representatives has already unanimously, I understand, reported favorably a similar bill to the House, and it is now under discussion in that body.

Mr. President, I regard the statement of Admiral Standley as a most unfortunate one. As a matter of fact, information of aid extended by the United States to the Russian armies has been given to the Russian people. I am advised that Pravda, which is the official newspaper of the Communist Party and the Government of Russia, on the 27th day of January printed in its columns a report made by Mr. Stettinius, the Lend-Lease Administrator, as to the aid which had been extended up until that date. I am furthermore advised that the Russian press, from time to time, carries the addresses and speeches of Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt with respect to what we have been doing and what we purpose to do with regard to Russia.

I desire to submit a brief statement of what we have been doing in that regard within the scope of the war.

For the morning newspapers of March 8 Mr. Stettinius released a press statement which I ask that the clerk read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, made public today the following facts and figures on lend-lease aid to Russia:

In addition to the many thousand planes, tanks, and guns shipped to the Soviet Union the United States has provided: (1) Considerable quantities of raw materials for Russia's munitions industry; (2) important transportation and communications equipment for use along and behind the long Russian front.

Up to February 1, 1943, we had shipped to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics more than 580,000 tons of steel, 46,000 tons of aluminum and duraluminum, 21,500 tons of zinc, 94,000 tons of copper and brass, and other industrial materials such as nickel and molybdenum for Soviet factories making planes, tanks, and other war equipment. We have shipped 50,000 tons of toluol and TNT and 75,000 tons of other chemicals for Soviet production of bombs, high explosive shells, and other munitions.

For Soviet railroads we have sent 75,000 tons of rails and 17,000 tons of other railroad equipment. We have sent 140,000 field telephones in addition to hundreds of thousands of miles of field telephone wire. We have shipped 268,000 tons of petroleum products for the operation of Soviet planes and trucks.

Of the 99,000 military motor vehicles other than tanks shipped to Soviet Union from the United States tens of thousands of trucks are employed in maintaining supply lines behind the Russian front. We have shipped 72,500 trucks, 17,500 jeeps and armored cars, 7,700 motorcycles and 1,300 military tractors.

We have shipped nearly 3,000,000 pairs of army boots for Soviet soldiers who battle in snow and ice and mud in addition to 18,000 tons of sole leather for Red Army shoes made in Soviet factories.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, my authority for referring to the action of Pravda, the newspaper of Moscow, is that the New York Times on January 24, 1943, reported that Pravda, one of the leading newspapers of the Soviet Union, contained a news item about the planes, tanks, motor vehicles, and like articles,

supplied to the Soviets by the British and ourselves.

I wish to call attention to the fact that those who use such articles—soldiers and others—are bound to know that they are from the United States, because they have characteristics and individualities which distinguish them from articles manufactured in other countries. The people of Russia, seeing and using a great multitude of United States and British lend-lease supplies, must of necessity know of the lend-lease aid which has been supplied to Russia.

I think it is of interest to note that a recent story by Mr. Henry Cassidy, who is head of the Associated Press Bureau in Moscow, clearly indicates that the people of Soviet Russia not only know of but appreciate the supplies which have been sent to them under lend-lease. The full report of Mr. Cassidy's article, which appeared in the New York Times of March 6, indicates that the people of Russia know a good deal about the lend-lease aid which is reaching them. Mr. Cassidy also had an article in the February 28 issue of the Washington Star, which points out substantially the same facts about the knowledge of the Russian people as to lend-lease aid.

The Russian newspapers generally report in full the speeches of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, many of which relate to lend-lease aid.

I should like to have Senators observe that up to March 1, 1943, the United States had sent 3,250,000 tons of lend-lease supplies to Russia, covering such a great variety of items of distinctly American type that the Russian soldiers and people, as I observed a moment ago, are bound to know whence these articles come.

We have sent to Russia more than 2,600 airplanes, more than 3,000 tanks, more than 130,000 submachine guns, about 90,000 jeeps, armored cars, and other military vehicles, hundreds of thousands of field telephones, thousands of miles of field telephone wire, and 580,000 tons of steel and steel products.

We have also sent them American motorcycles, gas-driven generators, chemicals and chemical products, army boots and sole leather, and other industrial products. In addition to these munitions, large quantities of American food have been sent to Russia, and as to much of this there are various indications to the Soviet Army and the Russian people that the food has come from this country.

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD without reading a brief report prepared by Mr. Stettinius, issued on January 20, 1943, with respect to expenditures in behalf of Russia. The statement gives an outline of supplies furnished up to the time of the report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States made important progress in 1942 in sending arms and other supplies to the Soviet Union under lend-lease. We have not yet been able to send as much as we should like—or as much as the Soviet Army needs—and part of what we have sent

has been lost on the way. But, after a slow start, lend-lease shipments have greatly increased. They are continuing to increase in spite of the shortage of shipping and enemy attacks along the difficult supply routes to Russia.

Lend-lease shipments of war supplies to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in November 1942 reached a new high. In November 1942 the exports to Russia were 13 times the total sent in January 1942. Two-thirds of the value of November shipments were accounted for by military items. The balance were industrial materials for Soviet munitions factories and food for the Soviet Army.

Up to January 1, 1943, the United States has shipped to the Soviet Union under lend-lease more than 3,200 tanks. This is more than have been sent under lend-lease to any other country since the beginning of the lend-lease program in March 1941, although lend-lease aid to Russia did not begin until October 1941—8 months later.

We have sent to the Soviet Union under lend-lease almost 2,600 planes. This is more than we have shipped to the United Kingdom or any other military theater. We have sent 81,000 trucks and jeeps and other military motor vehicles to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The United Kingdom has also supplied the Soviet Union with quantities of military equipment produced in Great Britain. The United Kingdom has shipped to Russia more than 2,600 tanks and more than 2,000 planes. These arms are being supplied to Russia by the United Kingdom on a lend-lease basis.

Lend-lease shipments of food to the Soviet Union from the United States are rapidly growing in importance. We have now begun sending food to the Soviet Union in greater quantities than to the United Kingdom. As the Soviet armies take the offensive a sufficient supply of food is as vital to their success as planes and tanks.

The people of the Soviet Union have so far waged their magnificent battle against the Nazis principally with their own arms. But lend-lease aid to Russia has started to grow to sizable proportions. It will grow still more in 1943.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD another report by Mr. Stettinius for release February 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the beginning of the Soviet aid program the United States has shipped more than 2,900,000 tons of war supplies to the Soviet Union.

Lend-lease shipments of war supplies to the Soviet Union in January were almost 10 percent greater than in the previous month.

The great majority of the supplies that we have shipped to Russia are reaching their destinations. In December 1942 and January 1943 there were no losses, although further losses in later months are to be expected.

Two-thirds of all shipments to the Soviet Union from the United States have been made in American ships.

The Soviet Army continues to sustain its great offensives principally with Russian-produced weapons. Lend-lease supplies have played a small but important part. American tanks, planes, and trucks are continuing to go forward. In addition we have sent to the Soviet Union many other vital military supplies. For example, we have sent hundreds of thousands of miles of field telephone wire which have been of major importance in the maintenance of Soviet Army communications on the 3,000-mile Russian front. We have shipped a considerable



amount of steel, which Soviet factories have made into Russian tanks, and chemicals, which they have used in the manufacture of Russian bombs and high-explosive shells that are now ripping apart the Nazi lines.

January shipments of food to Russia were one-fifth larger than in December. This food is urgently needed by the Soviet Army. We sent many thousands of tons of wheat and flour, sugar, canned pork, dried beans and other vegetables, lard, and vegetable fats. We have so far been able to send only very small amounts of butter, which the Russians have requested especially for their wounded soldiers in military hospitals. In January butter shipments amounted to 682 tons. This was the equivalent of less than one-sixth of an ounce from each man, woman, and child in the United States.

We shall continue to make every effort to increase the flow of lend-lease supplies for Russia to greater proportions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has had interim reports from the Lend-Lease Administrator and his assistants and has a full and complete report, partly in public hearings and partly in executive hearings, the reports of which are not yet printed, as to the volume of aid which we have been sending to Russia.

It is most unfortunate that any incident might be provoked at this time which would in anywise cause any friction or unpleasant reaction as between Russia and the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very happy that the Senator has presented the record this morning in the fashion in which he has presented it. The able Vice President of the United States sounded a timely warning yesterday about the necessity for our future friendly relationship with Russia. He said, among other things, that in connection with future contacts it is very necessary that we do not "double-cross" Russia. At least on the fact of the record up to date I am sure we can all agree—can we not—that we have not double-crossed Russia as yet?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is absolutely accurate in his implication, and I thank him for the interruption.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the report of Mr. Stettinius up to December 31, 1942, which reveals that we have extended aid, in terms of dollars, in the amount of \$1,532,230,000 for arms, munitions, and supplies for Russian account.

I wish to observe that great volumes of these supplies intended for Russia had to be carried by convoy through the Arctic Sea to the northern ports of Russia. In the past we have suffered very severe losses in those convoys. Some of the munitions intended for Russia never reached her because of the dangers and hazards of sea transportation; but in recent months our losses have greatly declined, and for the past 2 or 3 months they have been insignificant. With the opening of spring, however, the Lend-Lease Administrator is quite frank in saying that the percentage of losses may increase over the low point which

we have been experiencing in the immediate past.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the American people and to the Russian people that, regardless of what Admiral Standley may have said, regardless of what his reactions may be, the people of the United States and the Congress will not be deterred in going ahead with the reenactment of lend-lease, and in continuing to supply to Russia every available ounce of material and food necessary to the winning of the war. We recognize the magnificent contribution which Russia has made to the war effort. We gladly, and without any reluctance, have been sending these supplies, and we shall not be deterred by any incident of the nature quoted in the press this morning.

We are doing this not simply as an act of generosity to Russia, but because we are acting as her ally, and every supply and munition which we can give to the Russians lessens the burden which otherwise we should have to bear in making war.

It is highly important that we maintain this cordial relationship with Russia, not alone during the dark days of the war, but when peace at last shall come. Russia is bound to know that she will need the moral support and cooperation of the United States and the other United Nations when the war shall come to an end no less than she needs them now. She will never be able to forget that at a time when she thought she was enjoying cordial relationships, relationships of friendship, practically the relationship of an ally with Germany, the Germans treacherously assailed her, invaded her soil, and destroyed the lives of her citizens. When peace shall come she cannot ever lie down to slumber at night, with Germany at her flank, without the consciousness of the assurance of aid from the other Allied Nations in some form of collective security, so as to make sure that the world shall not again be drenched in blood by such a war and such a tragedy as we are now witnessing in the world.

I would remind Admiral Standley, and all others who are interested, that while there is no western front already established by military force, the establishment of a front in north Africa has been of tremendous aid and succor and assistance to the Russian armies. With the establishment of an American and British force in north Africa, which is a potential and perhaps an ultimate threat toward the western front, Germany has been compelled to recall from the Russian front many of her divisions in order to anticipate and to be ready to meet any attack on the west, and that has contributed substantially to Russian military operations.

Mr. President, I glory in the exploits of the Russian armies. Nothing finer in all the history of modern warfare has ever been written than the heroic and gallant defense of Stalingrad, and the courageous rallying of Russian forces, whose fortunes therefore had not been of the best, to drive from Russian soil the invaders and violators of their homes.

I wish to see Russia and the United States continue to cooperate. I wish to see them cooperate after this war shall have come to an end.

Mr. President, it seems to me that any man who is undertaking to look into the future with a view to the world's welfare and to the peace of the earth must reach the inevitable conclusion that when the war shall have come to an end the United Nations and the people who want to preserve the peace, who want to harness ambitions of conquest and of world dominion, must form some character of association or instrumentality for concerted action for the preservation of the peace and for the curbing of wild ambitions which threaten the life and the security of peaceful people and the destruction of free government everywhere on the earth. In that association, in that instrumentality, which I feel will be set up, Russia must be at the council table along with the other nations who have borne the burden and the brunt of the present war.

Mr. President, while we do not agree with her political philosophy, Russia has made a notable struggle for 25 years in working out her own domestic policies at home. After centuries of wandering in the darkness and the wilderness she has been struggling to work out some form of government suited to her own needs and agreeable to her conceptions of political philosophy.

We are not concerned directly with what Russia may do with respect to her own domestic affairs, but in an international sense we cannot ignore a great people with a population of 160,000,000, holding dominion over the wide sweeps of Europe and Asia. We cannot ignore her, and I for one shall welcome the cooperation of Russia in after-the-war conferences and agreements as we have welcomed her cooperation in the struggle we are now making for the survival of free government and democratic institutions.

Mr. President, I regret the necessity to criticize the ineptness of our Ambassador to Russia. I cannot understand why he should make such a statement as he did without having had accurate information about the matter. But the information which has come to me—not in a great volume—convinces me that the Russian people and the Russian Government do know of the aid which the United States is undertaking to send to Russia. Perhaps in its volume it is disappointing. I can understand how the Russians want some troops to stand by their side, troops from the other United Nations. I can understand how Russia would like to have swarms of American and British and other airplanes hovering along the flanks of her armies as they advance across the snows of Russia. I can understand how Russia would like to feel that the navies of the other United Nations are ringed about her in support of her war effort. But, Mr. President, the United States is doing all that it possibly can to get supplies to Russia. We do not command the seas, because there, lying in wait, is the deadly submarine. We do not command the coasts of Norway and the far Arctic from which land-based planes have

soared out and assaulted our convoys and sunk our ships. We are not only sending supplies through the northern ports, but we have been sending them up through the Middle East, through Iraq, from Basra on the Persian Gulf, and we shall continue to send them to the limits of our ability to secure and to transport them.

We all know that transport is the so-called bottleneck of the whole situation. It not only hampers us in aiding Russia but hampers us in our own military and naval operation in the South Pacific, and in the Atlantic, and in the European theater, and in north Africa. God knows that if we had the shipping, secure from successful enemy attack, it would be loaded with men and arms and munitions, and it would carry them to the battle fronts where our men, whenever given the opportunity, have performed so handsomely and so gallantly.

I trust that no unfavorable reactions may result from the incident provoked by the remarks of Admiral Standley in Moscow. I know that they came as a shock and a surprise to those who are in authority here in the United States.

Mr. President, I want this parting message to go to the Russian people: The Russians may not have given to our aid the publicity which we might feel was due it. That, however, is a matter for the internal administration of the Russian people and their government. As we know, they have been more or less secretive from the beginning with respect to their military operations. It is not unlikely that Mr. Stalin does desire the Russian people to know that large amounts of supplies and munitions have been produced by the Russians themselves, and, after all, Russian production has accounted for the large percentage, of course, of the munitions and supplies used by the Russian armies. But, regardless of all those considerations, I want to give the assurance that we shall not hesitate to go on with the renewal of the Lend-Lease Act; we shall not hesitate in supplying food and arms and munitions and supplies to the Russian armies in the future, as we have undertaken to do in the past. We pray God that as we look into the future of the months ahead we may be able to increase the volume of arms, and to increase the volume of munitions, and to increase the volume of food and succor to the gallant and brave armies of Russia, which are driving the enemy before them on the eastern front, as we shall, I hope, when ready, be able to drive him on the western front.

#### DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 729.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Until January 1, 1944, every registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor on a farm, or whose principal occupation consists of employment on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States; and until January 1, 1944, no such registrant shall leave such occupation or endeavor or cease to be employed in connection with such production or harvesting unless, prior thereto, he requests his selective service local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage in some other occupation or endeavor, to be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided*, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that during the consideration of this bill there should be a quorum of the Senate present. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Kentucky withhold the request for a minute?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment. I wish to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill is not yet before the Senate, is it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it is. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The bill is before the Senate. The motion of the Senator from Colorado has been agreed to, and the bill is now the pending business before the Senate.

The committee amendment, which is a substitute for the original bill, has been read. The Senator from Colorado now offers a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Senate bill 729 is before the Senate now by virtue of a majority report of the Committee on Military Affairs, which was accompanied by a minority report in which notice was given that a substitute would be offered on the part of the minority. The Senator from Colorado now acting, not as the spokesman of the minority, but in an individual capacity, as I understand, offers another substitute than that proposed to be presented by the minority.

Mr. President, the parliamentary inquiry is whether the offering of the amendment now by the Senator from

Colorado in his individual capacity deprives the minority of its opportunity to offer the substitute which was discussed in the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that it does not. The Senator from Colorado offers his amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment. That is an amendment only in the first degree. It will then be in order for the Senator from Wyoming, or any other Senator, to offer a further amendment, or a further substitute. That is because of the fact that the amendment proposes to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is the consideration of Senate bill 729, commonly known as the Bankhead farm deferment bill. The bill has been reported by the committee with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert new language. The Senator from Colorado has offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. McNARY. That is perfectly in order, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is also in order for the Senator from Wyoming, or any other Senator, to offer a further substitute.

Mr. McNARY. I think it is very important legislation. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had already done so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky had risen for that purpose. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Scruggs
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lodge	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Maybank	Wherry
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	
George	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Wyoming?



Mr. WILEY. I yield only that the Senator from Wyoming may offer an amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], it is proposed to insert the following:

That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended be amended by adding the following proviso: "Provided further, That for the purposes of this subsection, a registrant shall be found by his selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in local board release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in such release No. 164: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort, together with the minimum standard of production per person which he determines to be applicable to such additional agricultural commodities."

PROPOSED FOREIGN RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL—FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND RADIO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we have been privileged to hear two stimulating addresses, one of them being on the subject of freedom of the press. I did not know that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] was to speak on that subject, or I should not have prepared my address.

We heard another address, relating to the question of foreign policy. In my opinion, all the "fuss and feathers" about Ambassador Standley is only a tempest in a teapot. Joseph Stalin is the greatest realist in the world. I am sure he appreciates what America has done for Russia. He knows that a second front was opened in north Africa. He knows that Germany has been compelled to take from the front in Europe division after division of her best troops and put them in Africa. Moreover, Mr. President, Stalin knows that we have split the German air force, and that the terrific bombardment which Germany is now receiving has divided her air force so that it cannot repel the attacks of the Russians on the eastern front.

As I have already said, Stalin is a realist, and there is no need of trying to befuddle our own people. I think what we had better do is to recognize that now, as well as in the post-war period, there will be no "selling short" by anybody. We know that we are all in the same boat, and that if we do not row and work

together the boat will go down. It seems to me that that is the proper analysis of the situation.

I wish now to speak concerning freedom of the press.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the other subject, will he yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like again to comment along the line of my interrogatories to the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] when he was speaking.

While the statement of Ambassador Standley was amazing, I believe it was equally amazing for the distinguished Vice President of the United States yesterday to suggest that America is even capable of double-crossing Russia, or double-crossing anyone. I desire to make it perfectly clear that in my opinion American policy in connection with the war will never result in double-crossing anyone; and certainly the record up to date clearly indicates that on our part, at least, there has been no double-crossing of anyone.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. I agree with his conclusions. Of course, there can be no thought of America ever engaging in any double-crossing. We and our allies are engaged in a fight for our very lives. If anyone realizes that fact, it is Joe Stalin. He is a realist, and he knows the meaning of war. His country has given over 6,000,000 lives to this contest, and it is doing a tremendous job. As was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the people of Russia know that our matériel has been an important element in determining the reverses so far as the Germans are concerned. For us to use the statement made by Ambassador Standley, which was undoubtedly made under circumstances about which we know nothing, to give our own people the impression that we are about to weaken the association between us and the other United Nations, to me is mere folderol, and does not sound sensible or reasonable. Certainly it is not realistic.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for a comment.

Mr. WHEELER. I simply want to say that I agree with what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said about the astounding statement which was made by the Vice President, when he intimated that we might double-cross Russia. The American people will not double-cross Russia or any other country. Russia can be sure of that. I was equally astounded by the statement made by the distinguished Vice President when he said that today no one in this country will admit that he is an isolationist. I do not know what the Vice President meant by that, but if he meant that no one in this country will admit

that, before we got into the war, he stood for trying to keep this country out of it, then he is sadly mistaken in that viewpoint, because I did everything I could do to try to keep this country out of war. I thought we should keep out of it before we entered the war and I think we could have kept out had we followed the right foreign policies. I am proud of the part I took in trying to keep our country out of war, and I have no apologies to make to anyone in this country for the position I took.

With reference to Admiral Standley's statement, let me say that it so happens that I have been in Russia on two different occasions, and spent some little time there. I was one of the first Senators to come back here and advocate the recognition of the Russian Government. When I advocated doing that, many newspapers that now are shouting for Russia and proclaiming Stalin the greatest man in the world, criticized me. Some of them went so far as to suggest that I be deported because I was for the recognition of the Russian Government.

However, I was in favor of recognizing it, not because I believed in that form of government, but because I felt that the kind of government the Russians should have was none of our business. The position I took, which seems to me to be the correct American position not only now but in the future, is that we should not attempt to tell Stalin and the Russians what kind of a government they should have, or tell the Greeks or the Chinese, or any other peoples what kind of a government they should have. When we start on such a program we not only will have a war every 20 years, but we will have a continuous war on our hands.

I do not know what was the purpose of Admiral Standley's statement. I must confess that I was surprised at his statement, but I have not the slightest doubt that his statement was correct and true, because otherwise he would not have made it.

Incidentally, Admiral Standley, it should be remembered, was one of the strongest—should I say?—interventionists in the United States prior to Pearl Harbor. Admiral Standley was one of those who thoroughly approved of the President's foreign policy, and made speeches in favor of it from one end of the country to the other. So it cannot be said that he was an "isolationist," whatever that is.

The reason why Stalin is not telling the Russians of the aid we are giving them is because, as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said, Stalin is a realist. Stalin is for the Communist Party and its principles first; and, secondly, Stalin is for Russia, and Russia alone. He is a realist. He has stated repeatedly that what he wanted to do was to recover Russian territory. He is not for the four freedoms, and he has never committed himself as being for them. He could not commit himself to the "four freedoms" and still be for communism. He is a realist to the extent that he knows that he could not put the "four freedoms" into effect even if he wanted to do so.

So we should be frank and honest with the American people. They are not children. They know more than many of the so-called leaders in Washington give them credit for knowing. They are not fooled by the foolish statements which are being made by many people who say that they are going to reform the world or that they aim to reform the world. The American people want to know now what Stalin intends to do after the war. What is his program?

A short time ago a man came into my office, and I asked him to sit down. He said, "You know, I do not agree with you, and so I do not want to get into an argument with you."

I asked, "What do you not agree with me about?"

He replied, "I do not agree with you on your post-war views."

I said, "Will you tell me what my post-war views are? I do not know what they are. If you will tell me what part Russia is going to play and what part England is going to play and what part Germany is going to play, then I will tell you what my views are."

For anyone to say today what his views are on the post-war situation, without knowing the part that the realist Stalin is going to play, is nonsensical and silly; and the American people are being misled if they believe what is said by anyone who thinks he can tell them what part Stalin is going to play or how much he has departed from the philosophy of Lenin and Trotsky. I do not believe Stalin has changed or that he will change. Stalin is no fool; he is clever. He knows that Churchill is not for communism, and he knows America is not for communism. The American people believe the Russians are a great race, great fighters, and good people, but we also know that communism was forced upon them. Stalin does not dare to let his people know all we have done for them. He does not dare to let them know how much better off the people in America are. He knows he could not hold them if he did.

I apologize for taking up so much time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, apropos of what the distinguished Senator from Montana has said, a long time ago, speaking on the floor of the Senate, I drew the conclusion that no one could cut the cloth until an international pattern had been devised. Of course, that pattern is not definite. Because of the various factors mentioned by the distinguished Senator, and because of other imponderables which will arise in the future, we do not know what the pattern will be.

However, now that this matter has been brought into the picture, I desire to mention something else before I proceed with my remarks. It appears that in the near future, Mr. President, a number of conferences are going to be held in Washington—conferences on problems dealing with international food supplies, with economic problems in reconstruction, with freedom of the air, and with the so-called world order.

A number of those conferences are going to be held in Washington.

Let me say that I am glad to see the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee again in the Chamber. Last week I called attention to the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee had not given any consideration to the resolution which I have heretofore offered, Senate Resolution No. 22. I am hopeful that the resolution will receive consideration soon. I mean to say that I hope the Chief Executive of the Nation will give the resolution the green light. He and the Secretary of State are the ones who are holding it up. The resolution provides for a liaison committee between the Executive and the Senate; and it provides that the President shall appoint from the liaison committee one or more Senators to serve with other conferees representing this Government at the various conferences which are going to be held in Washington in the near future.

See how important that is? The President or his advisers certainly are slipping in their political acumen if they do not appreciate the fact that the country does not want the planning for the post-war period to be a one-man show. The people are fighting this war, paying for it in blood, sweat, tears, and cash; and they want something to say about the international planning. They want to be heard in the conferences which are to be held in Washington. They are sick and tired of all this national planning, which in so many instances has missed the boat. They want their representatives in on what is being planned internationally.

Therefore, Mr. President, I repeat that I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will see to it that my resolution is given consideration before his committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the Senator from Texas will be very glad to contribute to that end. I feel sure that the committee will give the Senator's resolution consideration; but the Senator realizes, I am sure, that the committee has been under a great deal of pressure, and continues to be under a great deal of pressure at the moment. We shall certainly be very happy to afford the Senator an opportunity to appear before the committee and to present his views, and we shall be glad to appoint a subcommittee to consider the measure. I do not want the Senator to feel that the committee will in any wise exhibit any discourtesy or lack of appreciation.

Let me say to the Senator, if he will permit me to speak for a moment in relation to what the Senator from Montana said about Russia and in relation to what was stated this morning by the Senator from Michigan about some reported remarks of the Vice President relative to what would be the situation if we were to double-cross Russia, that I have not read the Vice President's remarks in detail, so I do not know exactly what he said. However, I desire to say

that the United States is not going to double-cross Russia; it is not going to double-cross any other nation. It is not going to double-cross any nation either in war or in the peace conference. I do not think there is any possibility of having such a thing happen. The United States in all the negotiations and in this war is not pursuing a sordid policy. Its policy is not one of selfishness; it is not one of being covetous of our neighbors' lands; it is not one of seeking indemnity. We want to bring under our sway no foreign citizen as a subject of the United States. We are fighting for our institutions and for our life; and let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the United States will not, with my consent, and I do not believe with his consent, ever double-cross the great Russian people or any other people with whom we may be associated in the joint enterprise of winning this war and winning the peace after the war.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Texas for his assurance that he will give me an opportunity to be heard before his committee on the question of my resolution, Senate Resolution No. 22. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Texas for a moment further, I should like to impress upon him the fact that the resolution is not merely an ordinary resolution. Lawyer as he is, he knows that the treaty-making power of this country is lodged in the Senate and in the President. Historian as he is, he has in his mind the situation which has run down through the years, that when there was lack of cooperation between the Executive and the Senate, treaties did not come into being.

All my resolution would do would be to create what I call a foreign relations advisory council. It would request the President to create such a council, made up of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State and his experts and such other Senators as the President might desire to designate. Thus a liaison committee would be created. I repeat, every great newspaper in this country and many magazines have acknowledged the practicability of this proposal, and yet, for some months, no action has been taken. Now let us go into action on it and create such a committee.

To all the conferences, Mr. President, which will be held in the city of Washington in the near future the President would appoint from such liaison committee one Senator who would then virtually be the representative of the Senate and would feed back into the committee the information obtained. In other words, the thing we are talking about today and which we are fearful will be lacking between Russia and the United States, to-wit, collaboration and coop-



eration, would exist if there were such a liaison committee. I repeat, some of the best minds of this country have been in favor of it, and yet I have been able to get nowhere.

#### FREEDOM OF PRESS AND RADIO

Now, Mr. President, I desire to proceed to the subject of the freedom of the press and radio. In recent months we have heard a great many comments concerning the curtailment of news pulp for newspapers, the censorship policies of the Government, the F. C. C. licensing policies, Government use of the press, Government use of radio, and the invasion of government into the publishing business. Perhaps it will serve a constructive purpose for us to briefly review these subjects today. I may say, parenthetically, that I shall not repeat anything which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] said.

Before presenting this review, it may also serve some constructive purpose to survey the chronology of Nazi press and radio control in Germany and to study Fascist control of the press in Italy, along with the control of wireless telegraphy and telephony in Italy.

We should likewise be conversant with the control of the press and radio in Japan.

Mr. President, no comprehensive, inclusive survey of the control of press and radio in Japan and Italy and Germany has ever been made. In the past few weeks I have been working with the Library of Congress in an effort to assemble such a survey which I believe should be available to every Member of Congress.

The Library of Congress has had made for me translations from which there has been culled the information contained in the remarks I am now making.

First, let us consider the chronology of Nazi press and radio control in Germany.

In Germany the press law of May 7, 1874, recognized the principle of freedom of the press and merely prescribed certain rules for the exercise of this right.

In 1919 the republican constitution in Germany included in its definite statement of the freedom of publication—

“ . . . there shall be no censorship  
 . . . (except) against obscene literature  
 for the protection of minors.

In 1922, when the Republic and its institutions were under serious attack, legal measures were provided for matters which might endanger the Republic, but publications were considered private affairs over which the state had only such control as was absolutely necessary to safeguard the public welfare.

By February 25, 1920, the National Socialist Party program had been adopted and demanded—point 23:

Legislative combat against conscious political lies and dissemination thereof through the press.

By 1924 Hitler, in *Mein Kampf*, wrote:

It (the state) has to watch especially the press . . . not temporarily, but permanently; . . . must assure itself with ruthless determination of this means for educating the people, and put it into the service of the state and nation.

In 1931 the N. S. D. A. P. demanded measures to make the press German—that is, free from Jewish influence—and the suppression of newspapers which injure the public welfare.

By March of 1931 there was a German presidential decree for defense against political excesses, permitting police measures against publications endangering public security. The execution of this decree was left to local authorities, but the minister of the interior could request police action.

On January 30, 1933, the National Socialists came into power. By February 4 of 1933 there was a presidential decree for the defense of the German people which said:

Printed matter, the contents of which might endanger the public security and order, may be seized and withdrawn by the police.

On February 28, 1933, there was a presidential decree for the defense of the people and state which declared various articles of the constitution inoperative. That included the statement of 1919 about the freedom of publication and the freedom from censorship. Various articles of the constitution, including this one, were declared inoperative until further notice and the decree further declared:

Therefore limitations . . . of the right of free expression of opinion, including freedom of the press . . . are permissible even beyond the legal limitations otherwise applicable.

By March 17, 1933, there was a presidential order for the creation of a Reich Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda.

By June 30, 1933, there had been a clarification of tasks and jurisdiction of the propaganda ministry including jurisdiction and legislative authority over the press, radio, art, and the theater.

This group, incidentally, was headed since its creation by Dr. Goebbels. As a matter of fact, it grew out of Goebbels' Reich propaganda division of the National Socialist Party.

On September 22, 1933, there was a law written for the creation of the Reich Chamber of Culture. Point 25 in that law provides for the corporate state structure. Provision is made in this law for the creation of six chambers, namely, literature, press, radio, theater, music, and fine arts. The propaganda minister is given full legislative and administrative power for carrying the law into effect.

On November 1, 1933, Dr. Goebbels issued the first decree under the authority of the law I have just mentioned. His decree provided for organization and mandatory membership for anyone connected with any “intellectual creation or achievement presented to the public by means of print, film, or radio.” That decree of November 1, 1933, was put into effect by a further decree of the propaganda minister on November 9, 1933.

On October 4, 1933, we find a law policy in existence relating to all newspapers and publications and terming them a “public task regulated by the state in this law.”

On December 20, 1933, a decree put that law into effect as of January 1.

On November 12, 1934, there was a regulation to implement the unity of party and state. The control of the propaganda minister was established over the activities of the various chambers and the press chamber and radio activities.

Between January 1933 and December 1934 hundreds of leftist newspapers and periodicals were suppressed. Periodically, religious and semireligious publications were banned. Some publications, such as the famous *Ullstein* and *Mosse* newspapers, were reorganized.

Every important newspaper has a representative in Berlin. Once every day these representatives are given instructions by the Propaganda Ministry relative to the treatment to be accorded various news items. These conferences are secret and the revelation of the proceedings outside the circle is said to have cost one newspaper representative penal servitude for life.

Newspapers of lesser importance receive their instructions from the local offices of the Propaganda Ministry.

The German News Agency, DNB, usually termed the “official German news agency,” is practically an agency of the Government and it is recognized as a means of controlling the news at its source. This news agency has a monopoly in the distribution of news in Germany.

On April 10, 1935, the control of non-periodical literature was channeled through the Literature Chamber and there is evidence that nonperiodical literature was brought under complete control.

On May 31, 1938, a decree was issued to provide that prior to any definite registration in the professional list, the chairman of the state unit of the Press Federation must afford the gauleiter—the chief of the National Socialist Party in each district of the Reich—an opportunity to examine the question whether the applicant is politically reliable.

They start with the Constitution to protect them, but in the course of 5 years it is swept aside and they are told that a gauleiter shall determine whether they are for the regime in control; that is, whether they are politically reliable.

Briefly, Mr. President, Germany started with a press law which recognized the principle of freedom of the press. Germany had a constitutional provision which provided for freedom of publication. Then control was extended wherever it was deemed necessary to “safeguard the public welfare.” Then the National Socialist Party began to fight “conscious political lies and dissemination thereof through the press.” Then Hitler began to express his doctrine that the press must be “put into the service of the state and nation.”

Ah, Mr. President, I say again, we come to the time in Germany when, instead of being a free agent, the press must be put into the service of the state and the nation.

Then there was a broadening of the definitions against newspapers which “injure the public welfare,” then a decree

to permit police measures against publications endangering public security. Then there was a presidential decree that printed matter could be seized and withdrawn by the police. Then there was further censorship, and finally there was created a ministry for public enlightenment and propaganda. The authority of this agency was extended over press, radio, art, theater, and films. Then gradually certain publications were banned and some newspapers were "reorganized." Finally newspaper representatives were told by the propaganda ministry what they could print, and there was created a news agency—an official news agency—which began to be a means of controlling the news at its source. Finally there was control of nonperiodical literature, and ultimately there was investigation as to whether or not writers were "politically reliable."

That, Mr. President, is the history of Nazi press and radio control.

It is not my purpose to find any disastrous parallel in our Nation, nor is it my purpose to contend that writers in this country who are not "politically reliable" are scrutinized very sharply by the administration. I merely present this chronology of Nazi press and radio control in Germany as a document which I believe warrants study by every thinking American who is concerned with the maintenance of the "four freedoms."

Now let us briefly consider the control of the press and radio in Japan.

In Japan the press and radio met with government difficulties almost from their earliest existence, in 1861. The Japanese press was not well established until 1872. From its very inception it was used to serve imperialistic interest, and for administration propaganda. Most of the newspapers were founded by government officials, and publications which did not champion one of the government departments found themselves either confined solely to cultural and social affairs or, if any approach was made toward independence in political matters, found themselves subject to severe governmental punishment.

Even those newspapers which were consistently conservative earned the opposition of the bureaucrats. The press laws were stringent, and there was almost no Socialist and labor press.

The constitution of 1890 gave to the people of Japan the right of "freedom of speech in publication, printing, assemblage, and association within the scope of the law," but in practice this was not workable because of stringent laws which were applied. Laws and orders and decrees controlled the press, even to the extent of possible suspension. Until 1897 the Minister of Interior was allowed to judge and punish the violators of both laws and ordinances. Later the punishment of an editor or publisher was turned over to the courts, but the censorship of all publications is in the hands of the Police Bureau of the Department of Interior, and has been since 1921. Newspapers, as well as scientific and literary circles, have felt the pressure of government, and controls are exercised by means of police bans on the discussion of certain subjects.

It was inevitable that this control should be extended to the radio. Radio broadcasting in Japan began privately in 1921. By December 1923 there were regulations. Through the assistance of the Department of Communications there was created a trust which incorporated three private broadcasting systems by 1925. In August of 1926 the Japanese Broadcasting Corporation absorbed these three systems into one merger. After that a 1-yen initiation fee was required of radio owners and collected by the Government. In 1930 there were eight stations, and in 1932 the Government imposed an additional levy. By 1933 there were four Japanese radio stations outside of Japan proper—two in Formosa, one in Korea, and one in Manchuria. The whole system was nationalized. It was a very official proposition. It was government-made, government-controlled, and government-exploited by 1933.

In 1936 a news agency was created. It was known as the Domei Tsushin Sha. The business of this group was to "circulate correct information or the raw material for the formation of sound public opinion." A man named Shohei Fujinuma was Chief Secretary of the Cabinet. He was the Japanese Dr. Goebbels. At that time there was an Army, Navy, and Cabinet Information Bureau. It was a kind of propaganda ministry, and it encouraged the merging of small news agencies, so that the Allied News Agency was placed completely under official direction.

Penalties for evading government direction became increasingly severe. By 1937 control was established in the Home Office and War Office. The fines became heavier, and by 1939 it was a criminal offense to be found in possession of a radio set capable of receiving broadcasts from the outside world. Foreign residents were not exempt. Incidentally, in 1941 one observer wrote of the control of the Japanese military clique as "journalistic string pulling of bureaucrats which colors news beyond belief."

The Japanese legislation in 1939 included laws and regulations of a more stringent nature than any which preceded World War No. 2, and on March 25, 1939, there was enacted a law for safeguarding secrets of military material resources. It included a provision for the inspection of books, and it enabled officers to conduct investigations and ask questions.

This law was supplemented by another law on June 23, 1939, and by still another law on April 11, 1939, which placed all international telecommunications at the disposal of the Government.

On April 1, 1939, there was a national general mobilization law which controlled communications materials and services concerning information, enlightenment and propaganda. This law was revised by the law of March 1, 1941.

On March 6, 1941, another national defense security law was enacted and on March 8, 1941, there was a new peace preservation law which related to propaganda.

On March 28, 1941, the foreign exchange control law was enacted, and this law, of course, could reach the press

through its official inspection of business conditions.

That, Mr. President, is a chronology of the control of press and radio in Japan. It is interesting to note that the Japanese press has never tolerated independence in political matters. It is interesting to note that the bureaucrats of Japan would not permit a free and independent press.

The chronology of Fascist control of the press in Italy is equally interesting.

On July 8, 1924, there was an Italian decree which empowered the police prefects to confiscate any issue of a newspaper without bringing a charge before the court.

On July 12, 1924, there were issued certain regulations concerning the promulgation of the edict of 1848 which dealt with the press.

By early December of 1924 the minister of justice prepared a decree which has been applied to all opposition papers, and which defines as a crime the publication of news "which might have an injurious effect on national credit at home and abroad, or cause alarm among the population or give rise to disturbance of the public peace or prejudice the diplomatic activities of the government and its relations abroad." That, Mr. President, is interpreted as granting government officials immunity from criticism for acts of office. This measure also reintroduced preventive confiscation, and provided for the suspension of the paper.

On January 8, 1925, 111 members of the opposition read a document attacking the regime, and the paper was suppressed for publishing it. By the early part of January, 1925, 102 newspapers had been suppressed under the new regulations, and the following month other editions were confiscated. In February of 1925 still more editions were confiscated.

In October there were further reprisals against an attempt to issue independent newspapers, and by October 23, 1925, George Seldes, an American correspondent, was expelled for publishing the document of the opposition. He was expelled for "representing the Mussolini government in the worst possible light and giving the views of the political opponents of the Duce."

By November 18, 1925, other so-called antinational papers were suppressed, and by December 31, 1925, the public prosecutor had authority to prohibit the appearance of any paper twice condemned for press offenses. The printers themselves were made liable for all fines incurred by the papers they printed, and the local press association had to enroll the names of all editors. Only Fascist unions were permitted to enroll.

By January 7, 1926, the Home Secretary had issued a circular which indicated that in ordering the confiscation of an issue, the prefects need not trouble to determine whether an item was false or true. "The preservation of order is an elementary and primary duty of every government and is independent of any opinion that may be held as to the bad faith of the person who endangers the order."

By October 1926 there were only 27 papers left after a general suspension by



Fascists. Sixteen of these papers were dailies.

By October 31, 1926, after Anteo Zamboni had tried to kill Mussolini, all 27 papers were suspended for an indefinite period, and 4 were suspended for 20 days.

By March 12, 1927, the Central Executive Board of the National Federation of the Press had divided newspapermen into four classes: (1) Fascist Party members, (2) nonparty members with a clean past, (3) former anti-Fascists who had repented, and (4) the unredeemed. All other newspapermen were divided into two classes: Those officially recognized by the party, and the remainder.

By February 26, 1928, Law No. 384 had provided that no editor or any journal or journalist could exercise his profession except after enrollment in the official register, which is permitted only by the Government. There is no appeal from a refusal.

On June 13, 1935, a representative of the Chicago Tribune was expelled from Rome for an article on the shakiness of Italian finance. As far as I know, incidentally, no representative of the Chicago Tribune has ever been barred from Rome for any articles on the shakiness of New Deal finance.

By December 7, 1935, the powers of censorship of the Minister of Propaganda and the press were extended, and propaganda officials were empowered to order police anywhere to seize newspapers and books without instruction from the Minister of the Interior—who, by the way, was also Il Duce.

By August of 1936 the press had received instructions concerning some 25 explicit items which they could not mention, and throughout 1937 there were more specific instructions to the press dealing with certain detailed news items which must be treated in a certain way.

By 1938 the Italian Minister of Education had set up a committee to examine all post-war publications in order to eliminate all elements politically hostile to the principles of the Italian regime. A list of banned books was to be prepared and in the future publications were to be censored before issued.

I am sure that all can recall that on April 29, 1940, the Italians put the pressure on the Osservatore Romano for its pro-ally stand, and by May 14, 1940, the street sales of the Osservatore Romano outside the Vatican City were prohibited, and the paper dropped its war news column.

Mr. President, the control of wireless telegraphy and telephony in Italy is another very interesting subject to all those who are interested in the preservation of freedom, but it is a detailed subject, and I will not attempt to discuss it at this time, though I am now preparing a memorandum which I expect to insert in the RECORD at a later date. I can say that there are very rigid Italian regulations for broadcasting, and that the penalties for violation of the Italian code in this connection are extremely rigid.

I have given, Mr. President, the story of Fascist control of the press in Italy. It is the story of a political party and a political leader, who permitted no criticism, and who divided all newspaper

writers into classifications in respect to the degree of their loyalty to him and to his party. It is the story of a leader who was very intolerant of those who in their writings or in their verbal utterances disagreed with him or with his party.

Senators are all familiar with the First War Powers Act and with the Second War Powers Act, and with the provisions in these acts which relate to the utilization of vital war information.

We are familiar with the sweeping Executive orders which clapped secrecy and censorship rules on hundreds of commercial plants. We can recall that away back in 1939 there were protests of the Federal Communications Commission against any restrictions on the free flow of information to the United States from any source whatever within or outside the United States.

In 1939, as this Nation observed the 150th anniversary of the Bill of Rights, there was apprehension over the fate of some parts of our charter of liberty in the event that we should be drawn into war. The first among the 10 amendments which were enacted more than a century and a half ago provided that Congress should make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The whole question of press censorship was discussed the latter part of February 1941 after the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. George C. Marshall, had testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. The publication of that testimony brought up the whole question of the place of the press and the radio in times of war. High ranking officials in the national defense organization submitted plans for the censorship of press and radio which would have established a tight central control by officers of the armed services over information about national defense, but that plan was discarded early in 1941. According to reports it had been presented to the Chief Executive in June of 1940.

By the latter part of February 1941 the American press was cooperating voluntarily with the United States, Canada, and England, and voluntarily withholding certain items in the public interest. By October of 1941 there appeared to be a general agreement that we needed a clearly defined censorship policy rather than a voluntary policy.

When the foremost editors of the Nation gathered in Washington for their annual conference on April 17, 1941, the biggest problem confronting them was Government news censorship. At that time most of official Washington was free from censorship, though there were certain notable exceptions. When the President sent a message to the American Society of Newspaper Editors he went all out for a free press. It was evident, however, that in a democratic country which was technically at peace it was impossible to keep the lid on military secrets,

By the latter part of May 1941 newspapers were editorializing on the creation of the Office of Government Reports, apparently designed as a permanent superpublicity agency clothed with statutory authority. This agency was closely scrutinized as a funnel of all Government information which might technically have been a step toward the abandonment of the freedom of the press in America.

This agency, incidentally, in no way supplanted all the other publicity bureaus and press agencies in the various Government departments. More recently the Byrd Committee on Executive Reorganization reported more than 300 general publicity writers in the Federal agencies, and their number at that time was estimated at as high as 700. The propaganda at that time amounted to about 100,000,000 pounds a year and cost about \$25,000,000 for paper and printing. I will return to this subject a little later.

The Chief Executive made an excellent start toward the right sort of censorship. He picked out a good man to be the Director of Censorship when he selected Mr. Byron Price, of the Associated Press. The cooperation of the fourth estate was complete and enthusiastic.

The whole theory of press censorship in the closing days of 1941 was that it would be used to keep essential military information from the enemy, and it was distinctly understood that it would not be used to keep any incompetency from public discussion. The American press and the publishing world in general accepted in good faith the code issued by the Director of Censorship. This code was issued by the 15th of January in 1942. Broadcasting stations, incidentally, were under more stringent censorship than the press, because radio is not domestic in any sense of the word.

By February 8 of last year the White House had ordered all Cabinet and other high-ranking officials to submit their future speeches to the Office of Facts and Figures for advance clearance. Shortly after that the Office of Censorship issued regulations concerning international communication.

By March 19 regulations adapting the 1917 Trading with the Enemy Act to the needs of the present war were issued by the Secretary of the Treasury in conjunction with Byron Price, the Censorship Director. By April 1 there seemed to be some confusion about our censorship policies, and there was talk of reorganizing the overlapping and contradictory wartime information services, perhaps into a centralized agency with a unified policy for the dissemination of war news.

Three months after our entry into the global war our military censorship of news was more stringent than ever before in our history. There was some public confusion in March of 1942 because there had been a suppression of facts already known to the enemy, and a number of editorial writers throughout the Nation began to talk about the incompetence and the blundering of our press-relations policy.

By April of 1942 it was evident that freedom of the press was on trial. It was

also evident that we were standing at the crossroads between voluntary censorship and compulsory censorship, and the newspaper industry was facing a supreme crisis. There was some apprehension by May of last year that the administration was attempting to cripple the newspapers and suppress all criticism of its policies.

On June 25, 1942, the Office of Censorship published a revision of the code of wartime practices for newspapers and radio stations, which placed channels of public information more firmly under the administration control. Under the revised code important news relating to the operation of the war effort could not be printed or broadcast unless it had been released by appropriate authority or passed by censorship. The new sections of the radio code paralleled the press code in most particulars. Also new restrictions of a general nature were added.

By the latter part of September of last year there were grave issues as to what information endangered the security of the United States, and whether military censorship was being used to conceal nonmilitary purposes. Capital correspondents began to call for a showdown on censorship policies, and there were a number of protests on the way silence was imposed under the voluntary code. There was a continual expression of alarm over the creeping suppression which many people felt was a threat to a free press in wartime.

By December of last year the Office of Censorship was on a hot spot in connection with censorship legislation. It will be recalled that on November 30 of last year the Senate recalled from the House of Representatives a bill it had unanimously adopted authorizing the censorship of all communications between the United States and its Territorial possessions.

The withholding by the administration of the details concerning damages suffered in the sneak Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor met with widespread criticism.

The Office of War Information, originally intended to coordinate and control the release of war information, was helpless when the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Petroleum Administration battled over the wording of a press release on the suspension of gasoline rationing cards in the East. We are told that as a consequence, news of the suspension leaked out prematurely. The same kind of muddling occurred on the announcement of canned goods rationing more recently.

By the 5th of last month the Office of Censorship had issued new and consolidated regulations governing all communications entering and leaving this country. There was a great deal of comment concerning the Allied censorship in north Africa early this year.

My own feeling is that our censorship of news must not be permitted to destroy the faith of the people in their Government. There is no excuse for the muddling of administration announcements concerning recent rationing policies. Today press and radio are regulated as to what they can tell the public,

and we have a pretty definite organization to see that voluntary censorship is followed.

The Chief of the Office of War Information has authority to control all war information, but I do not believe that he has ever exercised this control of the War and Navy information services. It is my understanding that they still issue all their own releases, and that the Office of War Information intervenes only when the War and Navy Departments make joint announcements with other war agencies.

#### GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Mr. President, I now desire to speak about Government propaganda, which was somewhat stressed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], but I have some additional information which might supplement what he has already said.

At the present time old-line Government departments like the Department of Labor, the Treasury, and the others, maintain their own publicity organizations, as does every agency. It has been said that there are more than 30,000 press agents and publicity aides on the pay roll. How many million dollars a year that costs it is hard to say. The Office of War Information this year may need a total of about 4,400 people to conduct propaganda activities at home and abroad. That would cost about \$37,000,000. Our overseas propaganda by the Office of War Information may cost about \$27,000,000 in this fiscal year.

Mr. President, I believe that the American press has retained a remarkable degree of freedom in a world of rigid restrictions, and I believe that the American press has done an outstanding job of self-government. I have no quarrel with the general censorship provisions, though I do believe it is apparent that we need a further clarification of policy and a definite coordination of all activities relating to press and radio. It is obvious that even our present system offers possibilities for potential abuse. Against these possibilities we must constantly be on the alert.

Along with the censorship policies of Government, I think we must be aware of certain mechanical limitations which have been imposed upon the press. I think it is apparent that some of the attempts of Government to put press associations under the power of Congress to regulate commerce had in them the germ of rigid Government control.

The restrictions on news pulp also have in them the germ of rigid Government control. American newspapers began rationing newsprint with the new year, and our rationing has been on the basis of 1941 usage. The rationing of newsprint may be a necessary step, but it is certainly inconsistent with the extended publication activities of Government itself, and with the fact that Government itself is utilizing more and more space in American newspapers which leaves less and less space available for a free American press.

As every Senator knows, in January of this year the W. P. B. ordered the use of newsprint in 1943 limited to the ton-

nage used by each publisher to produce his net paid circulation in 1941 plus a 3-percent spoilage allowance.

During the last war, when there were shortages, the Government laid the facts before the representatives of all the industries involved. The plans were drafted and put into effect on a voluntary basis. These were cooperative restrictions, and they were by and large successful. That policy has not been followed effectively in the present war.

The amount of print paper which big publishers may use during the present year has also been cut by a pattern similar to that which was applied to newspaper and magazine publishers. It is apparent that this curtailment order could seriously threaten the press of the Nation.

Perhaps the best evidence of any need for curtailment in the amount of news pulp available to newspapers should be given by Government itself. Here in Washington the Government issues a snowstorm of news releases which are apparently still considered as essential. It has been said that the Public Printer in Washington is estimating a 50-percent increase in the use of paper in 1943 over 1942.

Think of it; we are telling the citizens of this country to curtail, yet these agencies are flooding the country, and a large percentage of what they use in flooding it is mere rot.

There have also been rumors in Washington that the Office of War Information would begin to issue a 4- to 6-page summary of the week's news in Washington. I am not going to comment on the pulp outlook, though a number of experts contend that the pulp outlook has improved. I am going to comment briefly on the publishing activities of Government itself.

Remember, in Germany, Italy, and Japan the government took over publishing activities. In this country we have gone wild in putting into the hands of Government some 50,000 paid newspapermen to publicize Government activities. On top of that we flood this country with carloads of material every day. Then the Government is reaching down and buying space in the newspapers of the country, getting space, interfering with the free press. As stated by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], the Government publication, Victory, has already been discussed on the floor of the Senate. It is only a small part of the material coming from the presses of the Government itself as a war publisher.

There are tens of millions of posters issued by the Office of War Information.

The Office of War Information maintains a publications and graphic bureau, and some of their publications run to almost 3,000,000 copies. Their pamphlets range from 16 to 32 pages. Some of them are simple, pocket-size numbers, and some of them are profusely illustrated publications.

Some of the volume of Government publicity was cut late last year, but it still has not stopped the torrent of Government publications, and it cannot be



denied that some of the O. W. I. publications reflect party politics. I must confess also that I am alarmed by the statement of the O. W. I. last month to the effect that the O. W. I. was going to take over all Government farm news.

Mr. President, I am alarmed also by the statement of the O. W. I. that it would take over the control of almost all Government news agencies.

I refuse, however, to believe that this administration is contemplating the publication of a Government-owned daily newspaper published at the taxpayers' expense.

It is apparent from all of the foregoing that Congress must closely scrutinize all the publication activities of Government, and it is equally apparent that the behind-the-scenes conflicts between the O. W. I. and the Office of Strategic Services must be definitely and permanently settled so that we do not have conflicts in the field of our psychological warfare. At the outset of 1943 we still had no agreed policy or coordinated program for psychological warfare—we still had no completely unified effort, though we had a half dozen agencies working on parts of the job.

It is equally apparent that we must separate our propaganda and censorship activities or else correlate them so that they do not create confusion.

We are fighting for the four freedoms and we must fight for freedom of the press at home. Last September the American press blew the lid off the issue of censorship, and one of our great journalists wrote about the creeping paralysis of that censorship and wrote about power-hungry bureaucrats.

Last February there was a proposal which would have made it a criminal offense to divulge the contents of any Government document marked "confidential." If that proposal had been enacted into law, then any officeholder with something to conceal could have gotten out of the reach of journalistic investigators.

Mr. President, we know that the press has continually endeavored to expose any bureaucratic and brass-hat incompetence. We know that the press exposed the misuse of the W. P. A. for political purposes. We know that the press stopped the plan to pack the Supreme Court. We know that the press ruined the 1938 congressional purge, but we also know that the press has played a major role in the war effort. It has made the American people aware of the menace of inflation. It made it possible to amend the selective service legislation. It made it possible to have gasoline rationing and it made the scrap drive successful.

The American press has donated nearly \$100,000,000 in space for war purposes. The American press made it possible for Henry Kaiser to do a job in the face of mobback opposition.

The American press made it possible to secure a clarification of the rubber issue. It exposed the early fan-dancer defects in the Office of Civilian Defense. It has continually pounded away on the issue of one-man control over war production.

It does not regard the New Deal and the war, in the words of Stanley High, as "joint and inseparable enterprises."

Mr. President, in conclusion, the encroachments on a free and untrammelled expression of public opinion elsewhere have sometimes been very gradual. They usually begin as propaganda for a particular administration or a particular leader and they end in complete control of all forms of social communication, so that today German newspapers are mouthpieces of the state, and German newspapers, according to Goebbels, are "sharp instruments of policy" ready to be played on "like a piano."

There, Mr. President, is a master of analysis, telling how the German people are being fooled through the newspapers, because the newspapers are used to be played on "like a piano."

The first freedoms to be lost by any people who are controlled by dictators were the freedom of expression and the freedom of a free press.

The tremendous increase in the publicity and informational activities of the Federal Government, the tremendous increase in material publicizing the Government activities, carries with it a distinct menace for the future.

Today the Federal Communications Commission has a life-and-death power which it can wield over every radio station in the land, and we know that the Chief Executive has the authority to seize any and all radio apparatus and equipment.

Mr. President, we find engraved on the Archives Building in this city the words, "The past is prologue." The only thing that stands between the menace of that absolute power is the Congress of the United States. So, I repeat: It is for us to be alert. We must make sure that on the home front there are no more Pearl Harbors.

Mr. President, we know that the twin threat of censorship and propaganda led France down the long road, from which there was no turning, to ultimate disaster.

I do not believe that these things will happen here. They will not happen here because an enlightened people and a vigilant Congress will never permit them to happen. They will not happen here because no man and no party can be so blind as to eliminate a great safeguard for the perpetuation of freedom.

Mr. President, if "the past is prologue," let us realize that we must take steps different from those taken by the so-called Axis Powers, because there the people lost their rights.

Nevertheless, it is well for us to be conscious of these problems and to pursue a policy of vigilance which will insure the perpetuation of a free press.

In other lands we have seen the first gray afternoon haze of government curtailments and censorship darken into the lengthening twilight shadows of an increasingly inflexible control, and eventually into the thick black night of fettered oblivion, with a dominant competitive government in the propaganda publishing business financed by the public.

Mr. President, that must never happen here, and it never will if the American people and the American Congress remain alert.

#### PRACTICAL RELIGION IN THE WORLD OF TOMORROW—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, very much has been said today about a certain address delivered by the Vice President recently. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the address which has been referred to so often today. The address was on the subject of practical religion in the world of tomorrow, and was delivered by the Vice President at the Conference on Christian Bases of World Order, held under the auspices of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, at Delaware, Ohio, on March 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are three great philosophies in the world today. The first, based on the supremacy of might over right, says that war between nations is inevitable until such time as a single master race dominates the entire world and everyone is assigned his daily task by an arrogant, self-appointed Fuehrer. The second—the Marxian philosophy—says that class warfare is inevitable until such time as the proletariat comes out on top, everywhere in the world, and can start building a society without classes. The third—which we in this country know as the democratic Christian philosophy—denies that man was made for war, whether it be war between nations or war between classes, and asserts boldly that ultimate peace is inevitable, that all men are brothers, and that God is their Father.

This democratic philosophy pervades not only the hearts and minds of those who live by the Christian religion, both Protestant and Catholic, but of those who draw their inspiration from Mohammedanism, Judaism, Hinduism, Confucianism, and other faiths. When we look beneath the outer forms, we find that all these faiths, in one way or another, preach the doctrine of the dignity of each individual human soul, the doctrine that God intended man to be a good neighbor to his fellow man, and the doctrine of the essential unity of the entire world.

Those who think most about individualism preach freedom. Those who think most about unity, whether it be the unity of a nation or of the entire world, preach the sacred obligation of duty. There is a seeming conflict between freedom and duty, and it takes the spirit of democracy to resolve it. Only through religion and education can the freedom-loving individual realize that his greatest private pleasure comes from serving the highest unity, the general welfare of all. This truth, the essence of democracy, must capture the hearts of men over the entire world, if human civilization is not to be torn to pieces in a series of wars and revolutions far more terrible than anything that has yet been endured. Democracy is the hope of civilization.

To understand the significance of these three philosophies dominant in the world today, let us look at each one in turn. During the last 80 years, the outstanding exponent of the sacredness and inevitability of war has been Prussia. By nature the common people of Prussia are simple and hard-working, and make excellent citizens

except where they have become infected by the Prussian doctrine that might makes right. The Prussian philosophy causes its adherents to practice many of the highest virtues, but these virtues are all ultimately placed at the disposal of supreme evil. Hitler, seizing the Prussian militaristic tradition as a powerful instrument in his hands and putting it to use with his own religious frenzy, has become the anti-Christ of this generation—perhaps the most complete anti-Christ who has ever lived. It is not enough to bring about the downfall of Hitler. We must understand the origin and growth of the Prussian spirit, and do something to counteract that spirit, if we wish to bring permanent peace.

The Prussian attitude toward war and supremacy has strong roots. Whether it reaches back to the days of Caesar or whether it first took form under the guidance of the Teutonic knights in the Middle Ages, we are certain of this: by the time of Frederick the Great, the Prussians consciously adopted the doctrine of total war and the total state as the chief end of man. Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II modernized and made completely deceitful and ruthless that which Frederick the Great had founded.

Shortly after Kaiser Wilhelm II rose to power, a generation before the First World War, one of the more tender-hearted of the German generals said, in addressing his troops: "Our civilization must build its temple on mountains of corpses, an ocean of tears, and the groans of innumerable dying men."

We know now, to our sorrow, that those were not just idle words. But God grant they will not be true much longer.

Bernhardi and Treitschke, through the printed page and through the classroom, preached the glory of war and the necessity of Germany picking a quarrel with England or France. Frederick the Great, Moltke, and Bismarck were proclaimed as being superior to Goethe, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven. Hegel laid broad and deep the philosophy of the totalitarian state. Other philosophers, and especially Nietzsche, seized on the Darwinian doctrines of natural selection and survival of the fittest to erect a seemingly scientific but false materialism to justify their ruthless acts.

In saying all of this, I do not mean to indicate that Prussia was the only wicked State in the world. England, France, Russia, Spain, and the United States were not always perfect. But Prussia and Japan were the only countries which systematically devoted the highest virtues of their citizenry, generation after generation, to the glorification of the state and to the ruthlessness of war.

The ancestors of many of the people of German origin in the United States were members of the minority in Germany who dissented from the extremist tendencies toward militarism. Thousands of these dissenters migrated to this country in the 20 or 30 years after the failure of the revolution of 1848. Their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren today are among our finest American citizens. They are patriotically doing their part in the present war for freedom, and we honor them for the spirit they have shown.

It is in the years since 1848 that the liberal culture of the old Germany has been so completely submerged by the worship of strength and power. In this period of less than a century, under Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm II, and Hitler, Germany has launched five aggressive wars.

The result has been that, over the last 30 years, the spirit of Prussianism has cost the lives of at least 20,000,000 men, has crippled at least 10,000,000 others, and has caused the nations of the world to squander hundreds of billions of dollars on death, destruction, and hate. How different things would have

been if this money had been spent instead on peace, prosperity, and understanding.

Germans by blood are neither better nor worse than Englishmen, Americans, Swedes, Poles, or Russians. But the Prussian tradition of the last century, and especially the Nazi education of the last 10 years, have created a psychic entity so monstrous and so dangerous to the entire world that it is absolutely vital to exercise some control over German education when the war comes to an end. Prussian schoolmasters have been of greater importance to the German Army than Prussian captains, and Prussian textbooks have had greater value than ammunition. It is the disciplined will to power and the worship of war as the method of power that have made the German Army such a terrible instrument of force.

Just as Hitler took the Prussian military tradition and organized it into gangsterism, so he took the Prussian education system and streamlined it to marshal the millions of German boys and girls behind his evil conspiracy of world conquest. Hitler's children have been trained to believe implicitly that the State is more important than the individual, and that the individual must be willing and ready to sacrifice himself for the German Nation and for the Fuehrer. Starting with the young mothers and fathers, married or unmarried, and taking the children through the day nurseries and a series of schools for different ages, Hitler has indoctrinated the German children with what he calls his leadership principle—that among men as in nature there is an eternal struggle between the weak and the strong, and that the decadent democracies are destined to crumble before the superior might of the Nazi elite. German boys have been systematically trained in brutality. German girls have been systematically trained to believe that their supreme duty is to be mothers, married or unmarried, of children dedicated to the service of the fatherland and the Fuehrer. Through the use of mystic ceremonies—pagan dances, bonfires, sun festivals on mountain tops, and many other types of ritual—both boys and girls have been trained to look upon Hitler as divine and they pray to him as God.

The evil influence of this systematic degradation of millions of German boys and girls cannot be counteracted in a short time. Even Hitler's death will not end it, because many of Hitler's children, conditioned as they are, will believe that he is still their leader, in the spirit if not in the flesh. Hitler dead may be almost as dangerous as Hitler alive.

This, then, is the vastly difficult problem with which the United Nations will have to cope, if the victory which now is coming closer is to bring more than just a short breathing spell before another Prussian attack is launched upon the world.

It is not up to the United Nations to say just what the German schools of the future should teach, and we do not want to be guilty of a Hitler-like orgy of book burning. But it is vital to the peace of the world to make sure that neither Prussianism, Hitlerism nor any modification of them is taught. There are many cultured German scholars with an excellent attitude toward the world who should be put to work on the job of re-writing the German textbooks in their own way. I believe these men would glorify peace and international honesty, reestablishment of the German culture of Beethoven, Schubert, Schiller, and Goethe, and the gradual preparation of the German spirit for an appreciation of the fact that a bill of rights for the individual is as vital as a bill of duties toward the state.

Doubtless thousands of German boys will come home from the war bitterly disillusioned of Prussianism and Hitlerism. Thousands of both young and old at home will feel the same way. They will honestly want

to help build up a new democratic Germany, and we, without yielding at all to the old warlike spirit of Prussia, should encourage them to try. We shall need the help of all Germans who give convincing evidence that they do not subscribe to the master-race myth and are genuinely opposed to the doctrine that might makes right. The re-education we insist upon should not crush out any sincere desire to practice democracy and live at peace among the world family of nations.

It will not be necessary for Americans to teach in the German schools. The all-important thing is to see that the cult of war and international deceit is no longer preached as a virtue in the schools. We cannot countenance the soft, lazy forgetfulness which characterized England and France in their treatment of Germany in the thirties. The cost of such short-sighted appeasement is too great in men and money. We must not go down that mistaken, tragic road again.

All of my discussion thus far has been concerned with Prussianism. Now I want to talk about Marxism. This philosophy in some ways is the child of Prussianism, because Marx, its high priest, was molded in his thinking by Hegel, the great philosopher of the Prussian state. Marxism has used the Cheka, just as Prussianism has used the Gestapo, but it has never preached international war as an instrument of national policy. It does not believe one race is superior to another. Many of the Marxian activities of the last 10 years which people of the West have most condemned have been inspired by fear of Germany. The Russian people, who are the chief believers in Marxism, are fundamentally more religious than the Prussians. The great mass of the Russian people is still hungry for spiritual food. The Russians have a better opportunity to find that spiritual food than have the Prussians under their regime, which glorifies the violence of the old Teutonic gods.

This question of religious freedom in Russia has been getting attention from the Church of England and from the Roman Catholic Church in this country. In a recent issue of the magazine *Commonweal*, which surely cannot be said to have Marxian leanings, the managing editor discussed two books by exiled Russians on the status of religion in Russia. Quoting from both books, one written under the auspices of the Church of England, and the other by a professor at Fordham University, the editor came to the conclusion that the position of the Christian Church in Russia has definitely improved.

The future well-being of the world depends upon the extent to which Marxism, as it is being progressively modified in Russia, and democracy, as we are adapting it to twentieth century conditions, can live together in peace. Old-line Marxism has held that democracy is mere words, that it serves the cause of the common man with platitudes rather than with jobs, and that belief in it results in a weak governmental organization. And we who believe in democracy must admit that modern science, invention, and technology have provided us with new bottles into many of which we have not yet poured the wine of the democratic spirit.

In some respects both the Prussians and the Russians have perceived the signs of the times better than we—and I hope that reactionary politicians will not quote this sentence out of its context, in an effort to prove that I have come out for dictatorship. The fact is that the Prussians have done an effective job of making their bureaucrats efficient in coordinating the social forces in the service of the state. The Russians have put great emphasis on serving and gaining the enthusiastic adherence of the common man. It is my belief that democracy is the only true expression of Christianity, but if it is not to let Christianity down, democracy must



be tremendously more efficient than it has been in the service of the common man, and in resistance to selfish pressure groups.

After this war is over the democratic capitalistic nations will need to prove that they are supremely interested in full employment and full utilization of natural resources. They will need to demonstrate that the consuming power of their people can be made to equal their productive power. The right to work at a regular job and for a decent wage is essential to the true dignity of man.

If the western democracies furnish full employment and an expanding production, they need have no fear of a revival of old-line communistic propaganda from within. If they do not furnish full employment, communistic propaganda of this kind is inevitable and there is nothing which the Russian Government or our Government or any other government can do to stop it. In the event of long-continued unemployment, the only question will be as to whether the Prussian or Marxian doctrine will take us over first.

I believe in the democratic doctrine—the religion based on the social message of the prophets, the heart insight of Christ, and the wisdom of the men who drew up the Constitution of the United States and adopted the Bill of Rights. By tradition and by structure we believe that it is possible to reconcile the freedom and rights of the individual with the duties required of us by the general welfare. We believe in religious tolerance and the separation of church and state, but we need to light again the old spirit to meet the challenge of new facts.

We shall decide some time in 1943 or 1944 whether to plant the seeds for World War No. 3. That war will be certain if we allow Prussia to rearman either materially or psychologically. That war will be probable in case we double-cross Russia. That war will be probable if we fail to demonstrate that we can furnish full employment after this war comes to an end and Fascist interests motivated largely by anti-Russian bias get control of our Government. Unless the western democracies and Russia come to a satisfactory understanding before the war ends, I very much fear that World War No. 3 will be inevitable. Without a close and trusting understanding between Russia and the United States, there is grave probability after this war is over of Russia and Germany sooner or later making common cause.

Of course the ground for World War No. 3 can be laid by actions of the other powers, even though we in the United States follow the most constructive course. For example, such a war would be inevitable if Russia should again embrace the Trotskyist idea of fomenting world-wide revolution, or if British interests should again be sympathetic to anti-Russian activity in Germany and other countries.

Another possible cause of World War No. 3 might rise out of our own willingness to repeat the mistakes we made after World War No. 1. When a creditor nation raises its tariffs and asks foreign nations to pay up, and at the same time refuses to let them pay in goods, the result is irritation of a sort that sooner or later leads first to trade war and then to bloodshed.

The gospel of Christ was to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, comfort the sick, and visit those who were in hard luck. He said that treating your neighbor decently was the way to show that you loved God. The neighborhood in Christ's day was a few miles in diameter. Today the airplane has made the whole world a neighborhood. The good-neighbor policy, whether at home or abroad, is a Christian policy. Those who preach isolationism and hate of other nations are preaching a modified form of Prussian nazism, and the only outcome of such preaching will be war.

If we want peace, we must treat other nations in the spirit of democratic Christian-

ity. We must make our religion practical. In our relations with China, for example, we must act in such a way as to enhance the material as well as the spiritual well-being of her people. So doing will not only be of spiritual advantage to ourselves, will not only do much to prevent war, but will give us more material prosperity than we can otherwise enjoy. And in saying this, I do not preach the missionary spirit as a forerunner of a new imperialism.

Nearly half the people of the world live in eastern Asia. Seven-eighths of them do not know how to read and write, but many of them listen to the radio and they know that the world is on the move and they are determined to move with it. We can at their request help them to move in knowledge toward a higher standard of living rather than in ignorance toward confusion and anarchy.

Throughout history, every big nation has been given an opportunity to help itself by helping the world. If such an opportunity is seized with a broad and generous spirit, an infinitude of practical possibilities opens up. Thousands of businessmen in the United States have seen this kind of thing happen on a smaller scale in their own businesses, as their broad and enlightened policies have increased their prosperity and given jobs to their neighbors. Christianity is not star gazing or foolish idealism. Applied on a world-wide scale, it is intensely practical. Bread cast upon the waters does return. National friendships are remembered. Help to starving people is not soon forgotten. We of the United States who now have the greatest opportunity that ever came to any people do not wish to impose on any other race or to thrust our money or technical experts or ways of thought on those who do not desire them. But we do believe that if we measure up to the responsibility which Providence has placed on our shoulders, we shall be called on for help by many peoples who admire us. When we respond to this cry for help, we shall be manifesting not only a Christian spirit but also obeying a fundamental law of life.

We of the western democracies must demonstrate the practicality of our religion. We must extend a helping hand to China and India; we must be firm and just with Prussia; we must deal honestly and fairly with Russia and be tolerant and even helpful as she works out her economic problems in her own way; we must prove that we ourselves can give an example, in our American democratic way, of full employment and full production for the benefit of the common man.

By collaborating with the rest of the world to put productive resources fully to work, we shall raise our own standard of living and help to raise the standard of living of others. It is not that we shall be taking the bread out of the mouths of our own children to feed the children of others, but that we shall cooperate with everyone to call forth the energies of everyone, to put God's earth more completely at the service of all mankind.

#### ARTISTS FOR VICTORY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed by the splendid voluntary contribution of the artists of America in dedicating their talents in our united effort for victory. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I have prepared on the Nation-wide organization of American artists known as Artists for Victory.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outbreak of the war, 20 art societies formed an organization, known as Artists for

Victory, Inc., for the purpose of doing what they could, in their own field, to assist the country in its war effort. Artists for Victory has since grown to 23 societies, comprising a membership of over 10,000 artists from all parts of the country. All these artists are imbued with a spirit of patriotism and a sincere and strong desire to use their talents for the winning of the war.

As you all know, the war morale is being impressed upon the public with appeals and exhortations via radio, the press, the movies, and other channels. Effective as these means are, they leave little lasting impression. Since the conduct of the war is affected by our fears and passions, our bravery and devotion, our loyalty and courage, and by our sacrifices, the graphic visualization of the themes of the war—to impress them continuously upon our hearts and minds—is a necessary factor in civilian morale. Graphic presentation is in fact a war weapon.

Artists for Victory has effectively demonstrated this in its national war poster competition, out of which 300 posters were selected for exhibition at the National Gallery of Art in Washington from January 17 to February 17. In this exhibition the war slogans which have been resounding throughout the country were given form and color. Artists from practically every State in the Union took part in the great undertaking of making the issues of the war clearly and simply understandable. In this effort fully half a million dollars' worth of art production was created by the artists. They devoted over 100,000 man-hours to this work, which they gave unselfishly and without thought of personal gain.

The themes selected for the posters are based on the President's first war message on the state of the Union, made to Congress on January 6, 1942. They deal effectively with important issues on the home front, such as Production, War Bonds, The Nature of the Enemy, Loose Talk, Deliver Us From Evil, Slave World or Free World, The People Are on the March, and Sacrifice.

The program of Artists for Victory includes distribution and dissemination of these vital messages in the widest possible ways. Its object is also to assist the Federal, State, and local governments in the prosecution of the war and, to that end, it commits the entire artistic profession to the united will to victory. Artists for Victory embraces the fields of the graphic arts, painting, sculpture, mural painting, architecture, landscape architecture, decoration, and all the kindred arts and crafts. On the Board are Hobart Nichols, president of the National Academy of Design, who is president of Artists for Victory, Inc.; John Taylor Arms, etcher; A. F. Brinkerhoff, landscape architect; Arthur Crisp and Hugo Gellert, mural painters; Irwin D. Hoffman, painter and etcher; Julian Clarence Levi, architect; Paul Manship, sculptor; and J. Scott Williams, painter, as well as other distinguished men of art.

Under these auspices and with the cooperation of numerous Government agencies and private industry, the results obtained are placing Artists for Victory in a position of growing responsibility in relation to the war.

With support from private industry, Artists for Victory was able to set up the national war poster competition, to mobilize the artists of the country for the purpose of obtaining inspirational fighting posters on the vital issues of the war. The artists who participated in the competitions were not motivated by any prize considerations but responded spontaneously out of a deep desire to help our country in this perilous period. Up to now, 18 posters have been reproduced, 13 of which are being used by Government agencies such as Office of War Information, War Production Board, the Treasury Department, and the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Additional posters were issued by

R. Hoe & Co., of New York, who also underwrote the expenses of the war poster competition and awarded prizes to four artists aggregating \$1,200. The Council for Democracy, of New York, offered four more prizes, and the I. B. M. Corporation another prize—a total of \$2,700 in awards. Copies of these posters are being distributed and shown in many places throughout the country.

President Roosevelt has lauded the patriotic spirit that dominated the efforts of Artists for Victory, Inc., and its artists, in a letter addressed to the president of the organization, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, November 16, 1942.

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: I have seen the report by Artists for Victory on its national war-poster competition. It is proof of what can be done by groups whose ordinary occupations might seem far removed from war. More than 2,000 war posters were produced by the artists of the country, not as a chore they were asked to do but as a voluntary, spontaneous contribution to the war. The very name of your organization is symbolic of the determination of every man and woman in every activity of life throughout the Nation to enlist in the cause to which our country is dedicated.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

It is gratifying for me to note that letters expressing enthusiastic interest in this patriotic exhibition have been received from many Senators and Congressmen by Artists for Victory, among whom are Senators JOHN H. BANKHEAD, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, GEORGE D. AIKEN, WARREN AUSTIN, JAMES M. MEAD, HARRY S. TRUMAN, Congressmen J. HARDIN PETERSON, JAMES P. McGRANERY, JOHN SPARKMAN, and many others.

The program of Artists for Victory is national in scope. Fully 100,000,000 impressions of the war posters have already appeared in magazines, newspapers, and periodicals—such as Life, the New York Times, trade, and art publications, etc. The United States Treasury Department is sponsoring a traveling exhibit of the posters which were shown at the National Gallery. This exhibit will be sent on tour to key cities throughout the country. Through this exhibit local War bond committees can dramatize the sale of War bonds and stamps.

The program of industrial cooperation is being continued through the printing in full color of 50 selected posters from the competition as war-poster labels available in perforated sheets. These labels will, it is expected, reach almost every man, woman, and child in the country with their powerful patriotic messages concerning the issues of the war. In this effort Artists for Victory has secured the cooperation of the Ever-Ready Label Corporation, of New York, which will print and distribute 5,000,000 of these war labels immediately. Artists for Victory expect that over a billion copies of these labels will be distributed throughout the country—through banks, retail stores, war-industry plants, schools, and many patriotic committees and organizations.

All sections, all factions, and all creeds are thus being welded together in a full awareness of the dangers that threaten the American way of life. The wide distribution of these war labels will, in addition, keep our people aware of the ideals for which we entered the war—ideals which might otherwise be forgotten in the stress of the struggle.

Artists for Victory is making valuable contributions to the country's war effort, and it contemplates as full a participation in the solution of the cultural and social problems of the peace.

#### DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on November 13 last a bill was approved amending the Selective Service Act. That bill contained the so-called Tydings amendment. A few days ago the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] introduced a bill in which he was joined by 36 other Senators to amend the Tydings amendment. The Bankhead bill was referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee. There was a close division in the committee for and against the Bankhead bill as presented. The bill was amended in the Military Affairs Committee by the Wilson amendment, presented by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and was reported by a 9-to-7 vote. The minority presented a report which was prepared by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and offered another amendment in the form of a substitute for the Bankhead bill as amended.

After this bill was placed on the calendar the members of the Military Affairs Committee, and others who were interested in the Bankhead bill, met with Senators who favored other versions, and worked out a second substitute. Today that amendment was offered by me as a substitute for the pending bill. As Senators will recall, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] then offered a second amendment, in the form of a substitute for the substitute which I had previously offered. That is the parliamentary situation before the Senate at the present time.

The difference between the so-called O'Mahoney amendment and the last form of the Bankhead amendment is not very great. The O'Mahoney amendment proposes to amend the portion of the act known as the Tydings amendment by affixing thereto an appendix. It would not change the language of the Tydings amendment at all. It would merely add a provision at the end of the Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment contains certain language which is objectionable because of the experience we have had with the operation of the act since the 13th of November. The objectionable language to which I have reference is as follows:

Every registrant found by a selective-service local board—

And so forth—

shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as—

This is the language which in my opinion is not satisfactory—

satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That language sounds all right; in theory perhaps it is all right, but in actual practice it does not work satisfactorily. In the first place, to whom shall the replacement be satisfactory? Shall it be the selective-service board, or the

applicant for deferment? What is to be the nature of the satisfaction? A man on a farm might ask for deferment because his services were required in the production of farm commodities, and the board could say:

No; we cannot defer you yet, but we will see. If we can find a satisfactory replacement for you, then, of course, we will not defer you.

The board could then send out to that farm some young person—perhaps a woman or some inexperienced farmer—and say, "That is a satisfactory replacement," while, of course, it would not be satisfactory to the farmer in any sense of the word. Therefore, that language is important and, in my opinion, very objectionable. It is retained in the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment.

I wish to point out another difference between the O'Mahoney amendment and the pending amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wished to try to define the O'Mahoney proposal a little more clearly, perhaps, than the Senator has done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no doubt the distinguished Senator from Maryland can do so, but I should like to point out the other difference, and then I will yield to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall do as the Senator suggests. I am not taking issue with anything he has said about the O'Mahoney proposal, but I believe that under the regulations of the Selective Service System, pursuant to the so-called Tydings amendment, it must appear, after consultation between the agricultural manpower officials and other officials, that the agricultural worker produces so many units a month of essential agricultural products. Essential agricultural employment is defined. What the O'Mahoney amendment does—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was coming to that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado declines to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The second difference between the so-called O'Mahoney amendment and the Bankhead amendment is with respect to the standards to which the Senator from Maryland has referred. The Bankhead amendment does not contain those standards. It provides for a formula. Something is multiplied by something else, and the result is divided by some other factor to find out whether or not a man is to be deferred. The formula is complicated and not practical in its application. The Bankhead amendment would endeavor to accomplish the same result by a different method. The Bank-



head amendment has a limitation substantially as follows:

Substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164—

Instead of the complicated and difficult formula to which I have made reference, and which was worked out by the "brain trust" in the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service Division, we have a sensible application in this amendment which any board can understand:

Substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164—

and listed in a certain list prepared by the Department of Agriculture. That is the difference between the two amendments in those particulars. Otherwise they are similar in their effect and purpose. Both of them are mandatory in their provisions and direct the Selective Service Board to make certain deferments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the word "substantial" mean?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Michigan is an expert on words. If there is such an expert in the Senate, it is the Senator from Michigan. I would not attempt to define for the Senator from Michigan what "substantially" means.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Tydings amendment fell down because its language was susceptible of wide latitude in interpretation, it seems to me that the word "substantially" is likely to fall down for the same reason.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think it is quite so wide open as the language contained in the act. The wording occurs in the O'Mahoney amendment and also in the Bankhead amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not true that the question of what is "substantially full time" will have to be decided by the draft board, and that the very defect contained in the Tydings amendment will be written in bold English words into the substitute now pending?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think it will take much judgment on the part of anyone to determine whether a worker is employed substantially full time. At least the mathematical formula which has been applied by the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service System will not be required to determine the matter.

On December 7, 1941, the Japanese struck at us in a most dastardly manner and involved us in two great wars. Up to that time most pantry shelves were full of supplies of all kinds. The small merchant had an ample stock of goods on his shelves and in his warehouse. The wholesaler was likewise stocked with nec-

essities. The packers had their storage space full of beef and meats of all kinds. The elevators, mills, warehouses, and storage places throughout the country were filled to overflowing with agricultural commodities. In fact, they were so full that they were a burden upon the storage facilities. Then came December 7, 1941.

Let us see what the situation is today. There is hardly a pantry in the country which is not empty. There is hardly a grocery store anywhere which does not have bare shelves.

There is hardly a meat case in any retail establishment which is not devoid of meats of all kinds. The packers are short of meat. They cannot supply the demand. The agricultural surpluses which were so burdensome a few months ago seem to be disappearing very rapidly. The other day the Department of Agriculture stopped the sale of wheat below parity price for livestock feed, which indicates that we do not have the huge surpluses we once thought we had.

What do we find the situation to be in the rest of the world? We find the people of China starving. We find the people of Russia living mostly on dark bread. In Poland, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, little children are starving for lack of food. In Spain a serious situation exists. In France conditions are even worse. According to reports received from our soldiers, conditions in north Africa are deplorable. The other day I received a letter from a soldier stating that Arabs sat around the camps of American soldiers with their legs crossed, waiting like buzzards for some one to give them a morsel of food, and that they made raids on the garbage cans of the American soldiers. Famine everywhere throughout the world, except in North America. Unless something is done, very shortly we also shall experience famine. That is the inspiration, the cause, the objective, and the purpose back of the pending bill.

Some say, "Well, let us see what the Army has to say about this." Mr. President, this matter is one which does not concern the Army. The bill has nothing whatever to do with the size of the Army. It simply has to do with the production of agricultural commodities. It is not the business of the Army. The Army has a very important business. That business is to fight the two most difficult wars America has ever waged. It is not up to the Army to produce the needed food. That task is up to the American people; and it is up to the Congress of the United States so to handle the situation that the farmers of the country may produce the food. That is not the Army's job. It is our job. The place where action must be taken is right here in the Senate, and the time is right now, this very day. In a few days it will be time for planting; in fact, in many sections of the country it is already time for planting.

One difficulty arises from the fact that there is a certain glamour about being a soldier, and there is a certain feeling of obligation on the part of all the citizens

to serve in the armed forces. That feeling is not peculiar to any one group of our people or to any people of any particular employment. The farmers have that urge the same as do the men who live in the city; and the farmers feel that they have a duty to perform in the service of their country. However, I desire to say that at the present time, under all the present circumstances, the successful farmer who has his farm organized and is producing sizable quantities of food, producing meat of all kinds, and grain of all kinds, is just as necessary, if not more necessary, to the war effort than is any general we have in the Army at the present time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with interest to what the Senator has said and have obtained a great deal of light from his remarks. I was wondering how the bill would change the situation in relation to farm help, in view of the fact that on the 6th of this month Mr. McNutt issued a directive. What would be the difference in effect upon the farm help of the country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The difference in effect, I think, would be considerable. The difference in the correct approach today is important, as well. The Congress, not Mr. McNutt, should lay down the laws, so far as that is concerned; but, as a matter of fact, the directive worked out between the Department of Agriculture and Mr. McNutt on the 6th day of March should have been worked out under the Tydings amendment on the 13th day of November. They neglected to issue that directive to the selective service boards. They waited all those months without issuing it. I am of the opinion that the only reason they finally issued it on the 6th day of March is the Bankhead bill, which came from the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, let me point out to the Senator that the directive also continues the provisions of the Tydings amendment for farm units and for provision of replacements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. I was going to mention that in further answer to the Senator from Wisconsin. The directive which has been issued still has the difficult formula of dividing and multiplying in finding an answer for all the selective service boards before a farmer can be deferred. But under the Bankhead amendment it is mandatory that farm workers, if they are engaged in the production of agricultural commodities essential to the war effort, be deferred. They cannot even be taken into the Army if they volunteer.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The other day I listened to a radio commentator who described the situation. I wonder whether this particular bill would provide any relief.

I refer particularly to the fact that, apparently, different cities and different counties are called upon for quotas which have been arrived at by means of some method of mathematical computation. The result is that in many States and in many cities there are still young men between the ages of 18 and 38 years who have not been taken into the service because in those places there is a larger percentage of single men of such ages than there is in places where men in the married group have been taken. On the other hand, in other States and in other cities the selective service boards now are drawing on the group of married men who have dependent children.

A few days ago I received a telegram from my own county, stating that a whole contingent of farmers was leaving from Milwaukee to go into the service. I wonder whether there is any provision that when the number of men counties and States are supposed to furnish under a certain call is apportioned, consideration shall be given to whether in those areas the group of available single men is already exhausted, and that, if so, the area should not be called upon to furnish married men under a quota until the number of available single men in other areas is exhausted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course the Senator brings up the difficulty under the Tydings amendment. However, before we leave the question originally propounded to me as to the difference between the legislative act and procedure and the directive or the document issued by Mr. McNutt, let me say that the directive which has been issued can be changed tomorrow, whereas if we make provision by law it will be on the statute books and will not be changed until we get ready to change it. That, I think, is a very, very important difference.

Now, returning to the Senator's question as to quotas, let me say that of course he has pointed out what has broken down the Tydings amendment and operations under it. The Tydings amendment is before the draft boards. Then the State is called upon to fill a certain quota; but the boards are down at the bottom of the barrel so far as single men are concerned, and they have to select married men. They have to fill their quotas. They have to take married men. They see a farm boy out in the country, and they say, "Well, we should get that rosy-cheeked fellow. He will make a good soldier." So they put him in class I-A. That is exactly what has happened. That is exactly what has happened in my State; and, as the Senator has stated, that is exactly what is happening right now in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator comment on this point for me: My situation, as the Senator has outlined, is that I have a basic prejudice against occupational deferment by class. I think legislation to that effect in respect to the selective service is bad legislation.

I think selective service ceases to be such when there is general occupational deferment.

On the other hand, I recognize the complete truth of everything the Senator says about the necessity of conserving an adequate farm-labor supply. As a result of all the inquiries which have been made, will the Senator say to me that there is no way effectively to protect indispensable farm labor under the theory by which we tried to proceed via the Tydings amendment, except by general occupational deferment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In my opinion, it could have been worked out by the Selective Service System; but they did not do it. They could have worked it out under the Tydings amendment, but they failed to do so—they miserably failed. As evidence of that fact, I call attention again to the administrative directive which was issued on March 6, which must condemn them. Why was it not issued on November 13?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I completely agree with the Senator; but I ask him again—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The real answer, of course, to the Senator's question—

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I should like to have—the real answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The real answer is that the crisis is so severe that we must have blanket deferment; that is, we must keep on the farm every boy who is on the farm. Senators can call it blanket deferment if they want to do so. The workers must be kept on the farms, and we must get more help on the farms.

A few days ago Secretary Wickard, in testifying before one of our committees, said:

Since I appeared before you a month ago, I have become increasingly alarmed about our inability to get enough farm labor to reach the goals that we have established for farm production this year. I am more alarmed today than I was yesterday—

And so on. The Secretary of Agriculture is alarmed, and so am I alarmed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So am I; and I agree with what the Senator says; and I agree with Secretary Wickard's conclusion about the situation. I agree that the directive of March 6 has been insufficiently delayed.

Then I come back to the question, Is it not possible to implement the Tydings amendment by legislation in the fashion of a directive, so that we may reach the problem directly without a general blanket deferment? That is my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what we want to do. We want to try to implement the Tydings amendment so that it will be effective. The only way we can implement it so that it will be effective is to make it mandatory. If we leave it optional, the same conditions will continue which have prevailed during the past many months.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Tydings amendment is changed in the fashion the Senator recommends there is no necessity that the deferred draftee shall be indispensable to the farm. All he has to

do is to work on it. As a result, it seems to me that anybody who wants to avoid the draft can get a job on a farm, whether he is indispensable or not in respect to the particular farm operation. It seems to me that a test finally has got to be applied to determine the indispensability of the individual who finds himself on a particular farm where he works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the Senator read the so-called Bankhead amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I have been listening to the Senator's explanation of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to read it, for I think it states the case in strong language. It says:

(k) Every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being a commodity essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred by his selective service local board from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The commodity has to be indispensable, but the worker does not have to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The commodity has to be indispensable, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But the worker does not have to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The amendment does not say so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It says he has to be producing an indispensable commodity, and if he is not producing such a commodity he is not indispensable, and he is not deferred.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator willing to have the bill read that the worker must not only be "engaged substantially full time," but that he must be indispensable?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to know who would determine the question of indispensability.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The same person who will determine whether the worker is engaged substantially full time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, no; the question is to be determined by certain facts, such as, Is the worker substantially making his living by the production of certain foods, certain commodities?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose a farmer has 10 workers when he needs only 5; the proposal would defer all of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not going to suppose for a moment that farmers would be so asinine. They do not do business in that way. I think we have to have a little faith in the farmers of this country and concede that they will play fair, and at least will not hire more men than they need. I know industry does that when they get cost-plus contracts which are charged to the Treasury of the United States; but the farmer does not have that privilege; he cannot reach into the Treasury of the United States and do that. If he



hires labor, he has to pay for it out of his own pocket, and he does not hire a single man more than he needs at any time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is undoubtedly so, but the Senator can see what I am trying to get at. I may have used an unfortunate illustration. Let me use the illustration of a man in town who, when his draft number is up, wants to do anything he can in order to avoid service under the draft; all he has to do is to get a job on the farm, and he is safe under the language of the proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He would have to remain on the farm.

Mr. VANDENBERG. For how long?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Whenever he quit the job on the farm he would have to go to his draft board and report. What we want him to do is to stay on the farm and "hit the ball."

Mr. VANDENBERG. All he has to do is to remain on the farm and he is exempt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He has to work at the production of essential commodities; that is all he has to do. In that sense he does not have to go into the draft; but we have to have men on the farms.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question which was addressed to the Senator from Colorado by the Senator from Michigan pointed directly at the divergence between the amendment now offered by the Senator from Colorado and the amendment which is recommended by the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs. That amendment takes careful consideration of the individual contribution of each individual registrant to the production of an essential commodity. It makes the difference between a broad occupational deferment to which the Senator objects, and a deferment, which is based upon the individual contribution of each individual registrant to the production of an essential agricultural commodity. When that condition exists under the amendment proposed by the minority the local selective-service board has no discretion except to grant deferment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why would not that achieve the same purpose as a general occupational deferment? I should like to hear what the Senator from Colorado has to say about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The rule we have applied to agriculture is a rule which has been applied to industry. We have done nothing other than to apply a rule which has been in effect right along insofar as industry is concerned.

In regard to the contention of the Senator from Wyoming, that he has a better formula for determining whether or not a man is doing something worth while on the farm, let me point out that our amendment reads—

Shall be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the

production of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being a commodity essential to the war effort.

That is the way we state it—"substantially full time."

I shall state the way the formula of the Senator from Wyoming works out. It is a complicated, confused, mathematical formula, the production of the "brain trust."

#### WAR UNIT

A war unit is a measure of production of essential farm products. In the attached table essential farm products are given a relative value in terms of war units. The following, for example, are each equivalent to one war unit: 1 milk cow, 20 feed lot cattle, 1 acre in beets, 5 acres in dry beans, 20 acres in wheat, 1 acre in carrots, and so forth.

#### CONVERSION FACTOR

The conversion factor is the percentage that a given product, whether it be a single animal or a single acre of special type production, bears to a war unit, for example: 1 acre of wheat is 0.05 of a war unit; 1 acre of onions is 1.00 of a war unit; 1 acre of strawberries is 1.50 of a war unit, and so forth.

The number of acres given to a certain type of production or the number of animals of a specified type multiplied by the conversion factor results in the war unit value, for example: 3 range cattle multiplied by the conversion factor of 0.07 results in a 0.21 war unit; 19 acres of Irish potatoes multiplied by the conversion factor of 0.50 is equivalent to 9.50 war units, and so forth.

There is the difference between the O'Mahoney approach and the Bankhead approach. The Senator from Alabama says "substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production of food that is needed in the war effort." The O'Mahoney amendment goes back to the unit rule. It is a difficult formula, and I suppose when the farmer reads it he will say, "I had rather go into the Army than try to figure out this provision."

Mr. TAFT and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio, who was on his feet first.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask a question as to the application of this to a farmer who is married and deferred because of dependency. Does the second part of the amendment apply to him so that a man would be prevented from going into a war industry, we will say, or does he still retain deferment by reason of dependency over and above any deferment given him by this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He may have two cars. I do not know whether he has or not. Not being a lawyer I cannot very well answer that. At least, however, this is the situation.

Mr. TAFT. The bill says every registrant engaged in farming shall be deferred.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well. A farmer who is married is deferred under this bill so long as he remains on the farm and produces certain agricultural commodities. If he decides that he wants to change his occupation and go to the city and get a job, he can go to his local selective board and pre-

sent the matter to them. They will render final judgment whether he is more valuable on the farm than he would be working in a war industry in town.

Mr. TAFT. That is what I do not understand. I do not think the bill is clear as to whether a man who is married and deferred on the ground of dependency is covered by this bill or is not covered by it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He is covered by it. Of course, every farmer, every registrant, is covered by it; it is all-inclusive. Whether a farmer has two children and a wife would not make a particle of difference.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator say that the intention of the bill is to treat a man who is deferred for dependency just as if he were a single man so far as saying to him, "You can stay on the farm or go into the Army" is concerned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as this bill is concerned, that is true. The question is not exactly as the Senator states it, "stay on the farm or go into the Army." He has another opportunity; he can go to town and go into industry, if the board approves such a change.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I was about to say that it seems to me that under the O'Mahoney amendment the farmer has to come to Washington and get a clearance from the Department of Agriculture, as I understand the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Colorado will say that that is not the case.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true if I read it correctly. It provides:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is in the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This is the language for which the Senator is looking. It is on the second page of the O'Mahoney amendment:

If the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in such release No. 164.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the formula I have just read. So the O'Mahoney amendment ties the farm worker to that unit rule, and that is the objection some of us had to the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we might as well realize that the bill deals primarily with married men. The farms of the country have been nearly stripped of the single men, and if we took every last single man left on the farms between the ages of 18 and 38, we would not get over 250,000. Those are the figures which applied a

month ago, and the number is probably considerably less than that today. So the bill deals primarily with married men on the farm. There are about 2,600,000 married men between the ages of 18 and 38 on the farms, and probably between a million and a quarter and a million and a half of them would be physically qualified for duty in the armed services. So when we consider this matter, I think we should consider that we are concerned primarily with men who have been classed in 3-A for family reasons.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Vermont, and I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that we are about down to the bottom of the barrel in all categories, so far as single men in the United States are concerned. Therefore, if this bill did not deal with the married men, it would be worthless, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I felt, at the time of the adoption of the Tydings amendment, and I have felt more strongly ever since, that, though it probably was the best we could do at the time, one of its defects in fixing 6 months as the maximum deferment for a man engaged in essential agriculture was that the 6 months might terminate in the midst of a harvest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was taken out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was thinking of it as it was first offered. But aside from that, my theory has been—and I have not been thoroughly convinced that I am wrong about it—that probably it was not started in time. If the local boards had been given full authority from the beginning to determine whether a man should be left on the farm or should be drafted, it would have been better than our belated effort now to correct the situation, because all the draft boards, in all the counties, are patriotic men, they are level-headed men, and they are doing a good job under the law and under the instructions which they have received from the selective service authorities in Washington. They know the men in their localities or, if they do not know them, they can find out all about them. They have facilities for learning whether the work of these men is essential, whether they should be deferred indefinitely, or for a period which they might themselves fix.

Many young farm hands have already gone into the Army. I would hesitate a long time, under the present circumstances, to vote for any bill which would take them out of the Army and put them back on the farms, although I understand that is being advocated. I am somewhat in sympathy with the attitude of the Senator from Michigan toward wholesale occupational deferment. I doubt the wisdom of saying by law that any class of citizens of this country shall be relieved from military service, because the war we are in is a war in which we are all engaged, it affects all of us, and to the extent necessary for all classes to render service, I think it is in the interest

of the country, and it is certainly in compliance with our theories of democracy and universal service, that that should be the rule.

I am wondering now whether we should enact the proposed legislation, and provide that all those now on the farm shall stay there, or that any others who are not on the farm but who go there before they are inducted into the service shall remain there, provided they are engaged in agriculture substantially for full time, leaving it up to the board.

In thinking about it, in connection with the farmers whose helpers have already gone into the Army, I wonder how they are going to feel about this freezing of other farm hands on the farm, when theirs have not been frozen on the farm but are frozen in the Army, insofar as that may be possible.

I am a little in doubt about the wisdom of the proposal. I am on the fence about it. I told the Senator from Alabama this morning that I thought his bill was half wrong and half right. There are certain features of it about which I cannot enthuse, yet I realize the necessity of conserving farm labor as much as we can. Can the Senator from Colorado relieve my mind of some of the difficulties which I face?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the first place, of course, the bill does not do anything about the man already in the Army. As the Senator from Kentucky has already stated, he is frozen in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the bill does not deal with those men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is unfortunate that the bill was not enacted before December 7, 1941, but few of us thought that the farm crisis would develop the way it has developed. We did not have sufficient foresight; our hindsight is much better. Now we find ourselves in a very difficult situation. We find famine facing us on every hand. We find famine all over the world. We know that we will be facing famine here in the United States. We are attempting to be the breadbasket for the world, and we know the world needs some country to be its breadbasket, and to take care of its breadbasket for it. We have that additional problem facing us, and this crisis has developed.

Simply because we were wrong in the first place, shall we say we are going to continue wrong to the bitter end, that we are not going to make any change simply because of the inequities between the boy who was drafted before the bill was enacted and the boy who was drafted afterward?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should say "No" to that question. Of course, we all have been compelled, in view of the novelty of the situation and the circumstances which we have faced, to grope more or less in the dark in seeking to solve many of these problems. In addition to that, sometimes we have not had the courage even to go in where the light of experience and wisdom would have directed us to go, because we are tender-footed and cautious, and we are not always sure what the reaction on the morale of the people will be in a given situation. We cannot ignore all that. I am not speak-

ing of political fear or caution, or the desire to walk on eggshells so as not to break any of them. I am talking about really following the lamp of experience in trying to devise wise laws which cannot be interpreted as a species of class legislation beyond absolute necessity in a war in which all classes and all citizens, regardless of politics, religion, color, or condition, are interested in the result. I want us to follow, as far as we can, the ideals of a democratic nation, in preserving what we are trying to preserve of democracy and equality.

Frankly, I am somewhat bothered about both the bill as offered and the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. I mean that I cannot be sure of myself in voting for either of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very certain that had such a bill as this been proposed to the Senate a year ago, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated. At that time we did not realize what the food situation would be. There was no way by which we could foretell it. As I have said, our pantry shelves were full, our stores were loaded down with food, our warehouses and storage places were filled, and we never thought we would be facing famine so soon; but we are.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator about that. I see that famine is predicted, and all that, but I am wondering how close to famine we really are, as a matter of fact. I know it is always desirable, when we want the whole people to do something, probably to overestimate the necessity, so that they will come up promptly to what they should do.

Speaking of meat, I was told by the Secretary of Agriculture not more than a week ago that, while many dairy cows have been slaughtered because of the economic situation of the dairy industry, there are 500,000 more beef cattle in this country today than there were a year ago. If that is true that would not indicate a famine in meat. I realize that the Army eats more meat and more solid, substantial food than the same number of men would eat at home. A different kind of food is required for the men in the Army. Of course, we cannot neglect them in any regard. Then, too, we have sent food to our allies; but the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations a few days ago was that our shipments amounted to only about 6 percent of our total production. The increased consumption of the Army and the Navy, and the increased shipments abroad, which are somewhat offset by reason of lack of shipping, or because commerce has been interfered with, result in a total percentage of increase in consumption which on the surface does not present an alarming figure. It may be that in some other commodities, of which there is not a surplus, or of which there may be a shortage, such a situation exists, but in the heavier, more substantial meat products, unless I either misunderstood the Secretary of Agriculture, or he was mistaken—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, the Senator from Kentucky did not mis-



understand the Secretary. The Secretary's statement is correct, according to all the statistics, but the Secretary has also stated that this year, 1943, we need a 5 percent greater production than we had in 1942, and 1942 was the greatest farm food production year this country has ever had. I presume that is so, generally speaking.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that 5 percent greater production an over-all 5 percent, over everything?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, that is an over-all 5 percent increase of everything which the Secretary said we must have.

Recurring to the meat situation, I do not think there is any doubt at all that we have more cattle in this country today than we have ever had.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt him at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, I shall be glad to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The number of cattle, as has been pointed out, is not the decisive factor. The weight of the cattle is the decisive factor. The Secretary has stated in recent days that there is a shortage of protein feed for the cattle, and that the estimate is that the cattle crop—if it may be so termed—now in existence in bulk for slaughter will be less in weight by several hundred million pounds than it was last year, notwithstanding the increased need. The Secretary also pointed out that the protein feeds the cattle had been feeding on are less because the people, by reason of scarcity of other foods, are eating much of the protein food which it was intended should be consumed by cattle.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know, of course, that it takes more protein feed to feed cattle until they are 2 years old than it does to feed them until they are 1 year old, and then sell them. At the same time more meat is obtained from 2-year-old cattle than from 1-year-old cattle.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But if we follow the statement of the Secretary with respect to the number of cattle we must also follow his statement with respect to the weight of the cattle. He said that, notwithstanding the number of cattle, it is inevitable that there will be a very large meat reduction because of the reduction in the weight of the cattle.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might be contributed to by two situations. One is that we have killed the cattle at a younger age when they have a lesser weight. Another is that we have run short of the type of feed necessary to produce the extra weight in cattle.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the question raised by the Senator from Kentucky, I cannot speak for any other State than my own, but I am familiar with conditions in my State. I have been speaking in the Senate about this very manpower problem for over a year. I

pointed out more than a year ago on this floor exactly the situation which was developing, which has culminated in the present very dangerous and tragic situation. I have received letters by the hundreds from Missouri. A man wrote me and said:

I have been in the habit of feeding 100, 200, sometimes 300 cattle. I have been feeding cattle for a great many years. I am 68 years old. My two boys have been drafted. I cannot obtain any farm labor. The farm labor has gone to the munitions plants. I cannot run my place and feed my cattle. I am going to sell off my cattle and put in a truck garden to support myself and the old woman until this thing is over and the boys come home.

The result is that while there may have been some increase in the actual number of cattle, the farmers are selling their feed upon which the beef cattle of the United States were always dependent, instead of feeding it to the cattle.

Mr. President, this is a situation which should have been perceived a year or a year and a half ago. Some of us have been talking about it on the floor of the Senate that long. I have had this matter up repeatedly with the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service Administration, pointing out that exactly this situation was going to develop, but we have been pushed away.

Since I am on my feet I wish to say that I doubt very much that any of the proposed measures are going to do any more than lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen, because many farms have gone out of production. The young men working on the farms are in the Army. I think, instead of this being a legislative matter, it should have been an administrative matter, because it is very difficult to legislate with all the contingencies in mind. It is much more difficult to handle it as a matter of legislation than it would have been to handle it as a matter of administration.

The whole situation, from the point of view of selective service, of manpower, and the Department of Agriculture, has, in my opinion, resulted in the most tragic failure this country has ever known. I do not know anything the Congress can do to correct it, except to pass legislation on the subject, halting and clumsy and doubtful as the legislation may be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask another question of the Senator from Colorado. I do not wish to take too much of his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am always glad to be interrupted by the Senator from Kentucky. I thank the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for his contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill and also the substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] propose to leave it to the local boards to determine, first, whether any given draftee or registrant is engaged, especially in agriculture, substantially at full time. That is awkward language, but that is what it means. Then also they are to determine whether he can go to a munitions factory, or to any other industry outside agriculture. Sup-

pose that a man at any given time is working on a farm, and is certified as being essentially and substantially on full time engaged in agriculture. He would be deferred. Suppose later on he decides that he wants to quit farming and go into an industry, where many farmers have gone. I have been told that for every man the Army has taken from the farm, industry has taken anywhere from three to five. I think three to one is a conservative estimate, and probably it is four to one.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that it probably is three to seven.

Mr. BARKLEY. Three to seven? The Senator means seven to three.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Seven to industry and three to farming.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a little more than two to one. Of course, they have already gone, hundreds of thousands of them, and they are working, and probably would be certified, if the board had any such power, as being engaged in an essential industry, to wit, turning out munitions of one kind or another. Suppose any given man who now is deferred by the local board on the ground that his whole time, or substantially all his time, is taken up in agriculture wants to go to a munitions factory, and applies to the board, and the board turns him down. Let us assume he decides he can get around that situation by simply quitting farming altogether, so that he could not any longer be certified as being engaged in an essential agricultural industry. There is no way of making him work on the farm if he does not want to. In that situation what would this bill do?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He would lose his deferment, and he would be classified I-A.

Mr. BARKLEY. But suppose the board then were authorized, or suppose it exercised the authority, to determine whether he should go to the Army or go to some industrial plant where he could get a job.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The board can do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The board can do that in either case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the board can do that in either case. It can determine whether he shall go in the Army or into industry. He may decide whether he will stay on the farm, but the board decides whether he shall go into the Army or into industry. It can determine the question either way.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to a matter in regard to shortage of food which perhaps he has not thought about. The fundamental difference between the United States forces and Hitler, for instance, lies in the way they handle captured or occupied countries. Whenever Hitler captures a country he steals all the food the country has. He takes it right away from the people. He robs them of food and of everything else. When the United States forces capture enemy-occupied territory they feed the people. We not only let them have what they

previously possessed but we bring in other supplies for them.

We expect to take considerable territory during the next months, and undoubtedly will, and as we take territory we must step in and feed the citizens of the countries we occupy. We want to do it and we will do it. It will require immense quantities of food.

Then, in regard to the beef, the people of the country have more money now than ever before. There is practically no unemployment in this country. Workers have money to buy beef. They do not use substitutes for beef. They take the real thing. Our Army is using an immense quantity of beef, and we are trying to get some for lend-lease purposes. As a result, even though we are in a statistically good position, so far as cattle are concerned, we are in a bad situation because of the great demand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I glanced over the Secretary's testimony in which he details the agricultural situation in somewhat pessimistic terms, but I do not find where he advocates this bill. What would the Senator say with respect to his position on the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know that he was asked about this particular bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will say that naturally the Secretary did not want to make any statement in direct conflict with the attitude of the President or the administration, but the Secretary said that no more men should be taken from the farms.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I saw that statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He agrees to the principle of the bill, whether he approves it in this form or not. He gives warning that this situation is growing worse all the time; that we cannot hope to have as much production as we had last year, not only because of the shortage of labor but because of the shortage of farm implements and the fact that the best workers, the young men on the farm, have gone and the replacements are not equal to the ones who have gone. He points out that we cannot get as much production per man this year as we had last year. With all these factors he positively asserts that no more men should be taken from the farms this year.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, my sentiments are somewhat the same as those expressed by our able leader [Mr. BARKLEY]. I have just returned from my State, and I know there is a very severe and acute shortage of labor. The State is engaged primarily in the production of food.

It seems to me that in considering legislation of the nature proposed three principles should be apparent. The first is that the country should be dealt with fairly, because the military forces have their imperative needs.

The second is that the legislation should be fair as between man and man in regard to the duty to perform military service.

The third is that it must be fair to agriculture, upon which such imperative demands are being made at the present time.

Leaving out the first principle, I am afraid that the proposed legislation does not deal fairly as between man and man in respect to their several obligations to perform military service. As the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said, if a man went from the city to the farm and obtained a job he would be exempt by virtue of the proposed legislation. As I understand, all that the bill or the O'Mahoney amendment does is to require that a man be engaged substantially in the performance of farm work. That does not mean that he must be diligent, or do a good job, or necessarily be faithful in the performance of his work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield? I must interrupt the Senator from Florida at this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The characterization which has been employed by the distinguished Senator from Florida does not apply to the minority amendment. I think that should be clear.

That is the substantial difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the one offered by the minority. The minority amendment would require a minimum of individual contribution. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would not.

Mr. PEPPER. I have the language of the O'Mahoney amendment before me. It reads as follows:

That for the purposes of this subsection, a registrant shall be found by his selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in local board release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That makes it individual contribution.

Mr. PEPPER. Indeed, it does not, if I read it correctly. Let me finish the clause—

and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard production per person as set forth in such release No. 164.

Does the Senator believe that that requires the individual worker to turn out a certain amount of work a day, a week, or a month?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely; it requires the production of the minimum individual contribution set forth in release No. 164, and because it does, certain Members of the Senate object to it. They want to eliminate the second qualification.

Mr. PEPPER. Does that apply to the number of cows a farmer has to milk, the number of hands he shall use in milking, and matters of that nature? Are they laid down in the circular?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The proper standard is laid down.

Mr. PEPPER. Assuming that I am in error about that, the other question is whether or not these criteria would exempt a man who should be exempt to carry on the farm operation. What is the standard to be applied to an individual worker on the farm to determine whether or not the farm could get along without him? Would the Senator say that there may not be cases in which a worker could be spared, and that in every case on every farm every man not yet drafted should be deferred?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been a farmer all my life, and I have never hired a man for 1 minute whom I did not need. I believe the answer to the question of the Senator from Florida will have to be left to the judgment of the farmer. As I have already stated, the farmer is not operating on a cost-plus basis.

Mr. PEPPER. If I correctly understand, it is not left to the judgment of the farmer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If a farm laborer is working for a farmer, so long as the laborer remains on the farm and works for the farmer, he is deferred.

Mr. PEPPER. Regardless of whether the farmer can get along without him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The farmer can determine whether he can get along without the man.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand the language of the bill which the able Senator is now sponsoring, it contemplates a blanket deferment, and a man could not be taken away from the farm unless he requested his selective service board to allow him to go somewhere else. Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that is not entirely correct. A man must be making his living off the farm and must be engaged in the production of certain specified farm commodities.

Mr. PEPPER. I invite the Senator's attention to the following language:

Until January 1, 1944, every registrant—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is not the amendment that is before us at the present time. A substitute has been offered for that amendment, and we are now discussing the latest Bankhead amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. The language in italics in Senate bill 729 is not now before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator kindly refer to the language and indicate the standard with respect to the need of the individual person on the farm?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will read the language:

Every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164—



That release lists all the essential farm commodities important to the war industry, and nothing else.

Mr. PEPPER. So it is not required that the particular person be found by a disinterested agency to be essential to the operation of the farm. There are many sons of farmers throughout the country who have no more right to be deferred than have the sons of other farmers who have gone to war. If a farmer can obtain another man to take the place of his son, or if the father is not sick and can carry on the farm operation, why should the Congress, without giving anyone any discretion to pass upon a particular case, say that the boy on the farm shall be deferred?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If he is producing substantial amounts of the food supplies which the country needs, he ought to be deferred.

Mr. PEPPER. He ought not to be deferred if someone else can be put in his place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Merely because he is the son of a farmer; that should be no reason for not deferring him.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator regard the pending bill as one which would be of very much help to the farmer if it were passed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Indeed I do, or I should not be trying to have it passed.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the bill give the farmers all the assistance the Senator wants to give them in cultivating and harvesting their crops?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not trying to give the farmers anything. I am trying to do something which will result in the production of food for the people of the United States, for our armed forces, and to fulfill our responsibilities in enemy territory.

Mr. PEPPER. I am entirely in sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but what I am suggesting is that it is only a partial solution of the problem. In some cases it may actually do injustice, in favor of one man as against someone who has already gone to war.

I mean to suggest, with apologies to the Senator and in compliment to the spirit of the proposed legislation, that I do not believe it would guarantee labor to the farmer. The farm labor problem in Florida would not be solved if we should pass the pending bill. I should like to see the able Senator and his committee and the very able and distinguished Senator who is responsible for the bill try to draft more comprehensive legislation which would guarantee an adequate supply of labor to the farmer and give proper discretion to some one—either the agricultural representatives in a given county or to the draft board—to pass on particular cases so that injustice would not be done anyone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator from Florida has said, the pending bill may not be a cure-all. We may realize only a part of the results we are hoping for; but it would certainly be of some value.

Mr. PEPPER. With the permission of the Senator I should like to make one further comment. We are freezing

farm boys on the farms and in the jobs where they are now, without any regard to the wages which they are being paid in the jobs they now occupy. I am in favor of the principle of occupational deferment. I think we should have had it from the beginning. Not only should industrial occupational deferment be provided for by a board which knows something about industry, but agricultural deferment should be taken care of by a committee or agency which knows something about the needs of agriculture. As I understand, in England the authorities do not freeze a worker in a factory unless they are satisfied about the wage rate and the working conditions in the factory. We know very well that there are places in this country where the wages which farm laborers receive are pitiful. In some sections of my State farm wages have barely reached \$3 a day.

I am not sure that it is altogether fair to a farm boy who is diligent and faithful in the performance of his duties to compel him to accept any rate of wage which a farmer may be willing to pay him, or which he may have been willing to accept for work in the past, and say to him that he cannot leave that particular job and accept employment where he would be paid more—essentially out of the public treasury of his country—than he has been receiving on the farm. As I have already said, we should be fair as between man and man. I do not believe it is fair to a farm boy to allow a neighbor's son to work in an airplane or tank factory and receive \$8 to \$10 a day, or work in a shipyard and receive \$300 a month, while the first boy is frozen by law and required to work on the farm and receive not more than \$1.50 or \$2 a day when he is able to make more.

I believe those factors are entitled to consideration, and I am afraid that under the terms of the able Senator's bill discretion is not vested in anybody to make fair adjustments as between man and man. I am afraid the committee has not gone quite far enough to take comprehensive steps which would guarantee labor to the farmers. I agree that it is the job of the Food Administrator to see to it that the farmer has labor, but this bill would not accomplish that end.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course we differ with the Senator from Florida with regard to the effectiveness of the bill. We know it will help and will provide labor on the farms; and we know the importance of producing food for the Army. In my opinion, as I have already stated, it is just as important to produce food as it is to carry a gun, and there is no difference between the two services so far as the war effort is concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] said we should work out a comprehensive plan so that the farmers in Florida and the farmers in California and the farmers in Montana and the farmers throughout the other sections of the country may be assured of having sufficient help. I agree

with him that that should be done. It should be done for the simple reason that anyone who views the present picture knows that at the present time we are having to furnish food to Russia; and, as a matter of fact, Russia has indicated, as I understand from reliable authority, that at the present time she is more anxious to have food shipped to her than to have equipment. We are having to ship food to north Africa, not only to our armies, but to the armies of other nations there, and also for the natives.

In addition, we have to send food to Great Britain. That food is being sold in the stores there, as has been pointed out here. We are sending food all over the world to keep people from starving and to keep them friendly.

We have to send food abroad to feed our soldiers. Furthermore, we are the arsenal of democracy, and we are trying to furnish a part of the equipment needed by Russia. We have sent Russia over a billion dollars' worth of equipment. We are not only helping to equip the Russian Army, the British Army, the Chinese Army, our Army in north Africa, the French Army in north Africa, and our armed forces elsewhere, but we are shipping equipment to South America and we are shipping machinery to Russia. We are undertaking to do that, and at the same time we are undertaking to raise an armed force of 11,000,000 men. The truth about it—and we ought to face it—is that we are not going to be able to furnish men to go to work on the farms in Florida, in Montana, and in California; we are not going to be able to furnish the men needed by our factories that are turning out war equipment, and we are not going to be able to have enough food to feed the people of Europe when we go into Europe, so that we can keep the people of Europe and of other foreign countries from "going Communist," unless we have a surplus of food in the United States.

We are the richest and the most powerful Nation on the face of the globe. We all admit it, and everyone recognizes it. However, regardless of how rich or how powerful we may be, we are not going to be able to keep all those people supplied with food and clothes and equipment, and at the same time fight a war and raise an Army of 11,000,000 men. We must not only raise this huge armed force but we must send them to the four corners of the world, and build the ships in which to send them there. The failure to realize that is what is fundamentally wrong today in connection with the production of our food supply.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri when he says that we are locking the door after the horse is stolen. The boys on the farms have left. Single men and married men have left the farms of Montana; they have left the farms all over the country. They have left them to go into factories in Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, and San Diego, in Connecticut, and Massachusetts. They have left them because the factories are paying higher wages. No one objects to their receiving high wages; but some of the manufacturers who are operating on a cost-plus basis have more men than they need; and the more they pay them and

the more men they have, the more money they receive. Under those circumstances we are not going to do the job we should do.

The other day the New York Times published a very potent editorial, which I had printed in the *Record*. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to proceed with the matter I have been discussing.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator will yield further for a moment, I simply desire to call attention to the editorial which was published in the New York Times. Certainly the New York Times has supported the administration's farm policy all down the line. It could not be classified by the Vice President or anyone else as being isolationist. Even Walter Winchell could not classify it as an isolationist publication. It was one of the strongest supporters of the administration's foreign policy, and probably was more of an interventionist than even the President himself. Yet the New York Times has taken the position that an army of 11,000,000 men may be too large. It calls attention to its position in an editorial entitled "The Size of the Army." The editorial is one of the longest editorials which have been published in that newspaper in a long time. The editorial calls attention to the fact that an army of 5,000,000 men may be more effective than an army of 10,000,000 or 11,000,000. It is one of the strongest and best and most recent editorials relative to the whole situation I have seen anywhere. It states that the fact that a man is in favor of a small army is no reason why he should be considered to be suggesting that he wants a soft war—nothing of the kind—but that he wants an effective army.

Everyone who visits the camps and who has traveled over the country knows that there is a waste of manpower in the factories and also in the bureaus in Washington. Go down to any one of them—I care not which may be selected—there will be found employees falling all over themselves—some of them single men, others married men whose wives are working and drawing large salaries and wages. There is no justification for that situation.

That is one reason why we have a shortage of farm workers; and the shortage will continue regardless of whether or not we pass the pending bill.

I shall vote for the bill, but I simply say that we should not delude ourselves by believing that the passage of the bill will solve the problem; for it will not solve it. Nothing else will solve it, and it will grow worse and worse if we attempt to raise an Army of 11,000,000 men. Someone has said, "We should do whatever the military authorities say." The New York Times says that the present problem is not simply a military one, and that in figuring out what we should do and what size Army we should have we must take into consideration the needs of agriculture, the needs of our war production in munitions factories, and the over-all picture throughout the country. If we do not take all those factors into consideration we shall bring

about disaster to our own system of government.

We have gone about the job in a hodge-podge way. Probably no one is particularly to blame for that; we are all to blame for it. Someone has blamed the local draft boards. They are not to blame for the situation. They were told to get so many men, and they went out and got them.

Let me say that I have prepared an amendment which I think I shall offer to the pending bill, providing that married men with children shall be exempted. Why do I favor doing so? Simply because of the fact that when we draft young married men we seriously affect the welfare of their wives and children. Someone has said that we should be fair, and that we should not exempt anyone by law. However, the President of the United States exempted some persons. I am not criticizing him; but I say he exempted men between the ages of 38 and 45 years. He did so by Executive order. He said that such men should not be taken, whether they are single men or married men with dependent children or otherwise. Why should we exempt a single man between the ages of 38 and 45 years? When we talked to the representatives of the Army who appeared before our committees they said that single men between the ages of 38 and 45 years should be exempted because a great many of them broke down and had to be sent to hospitals after they were trained for active service and were made to march 20 miles while carrying a heavy pack, and that of course they could not stand up under such service.

However, we shall have to use more than a million men in our army, not in combat service, but in doing mechanical work, in service at the airports, and so forth. A million or a million and a half men will be needed in such work. Men between the ages of 38 and 45 years employed in such work are doing a hard day's work. They are being taken into the service; but if a married man with dependent children is taken in, will his mind be on the war effort? When he is stationed at a camp, what kind of a soldier will he make? What will he be thinking about? He will be thinking about the mother and his children.

By way of illustration let me point out that I have working in my office two young men—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I must proceed with my remarks.

Mr. WHEELER. I assure the Senator that I shall finish in a moment or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want to yield very much longer. I will yield in order to hear the Senator's story.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely want to finish what I was saying. As I said, two young men are now working in my office. Each of them is married and has two children. When those young men are taken into the Army, their wives will have to go to work in order to support the children, and the children will have to be placed in some kind of an institution. I say that we should exempt the young

married men who are raising families; because if we do not do so we shall destroy homes and shall adversely affect children; and in addition to all that, the fathers who are taken into the armed forces will not make good soldiers, anyway.

I shall vote for some kind of legislation on this subject, but I fear that what we may enact will not do the work which we desire to have done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senator will not offer his amendment with relation to family deferment.

I promised to yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] very briefly and then to the Senator from North Dakota. After that, I should like to proceed. I desire to speak only for a few minutes longer, and I should like to finish. I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I have heard several Senators this afternoon express great concern over the evils of group deferment, and I thought it would be well to remind them that in the original selective service we deferred 20 or 25 groups, and one of the outstanding groups deferred as a group is made up of Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for that contribution. I think it is a complete answer to those who are greatly disturbed by blanket deferment. Now I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has made the statement I was going to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall proceed with the bill. I have only a little more to offer. The Tydings amendment, in my opinion, was enacted in good faith. It was thought at the time it would solve the problem. I thought it would solve it; I thought it was a great achievement and a marked step forward; I thought the farmers would be given an opportunity to remain on the farm and that the adoption of the amendment would result in keeping men on the farm. Unfortunately, it has not worked in that way. I have received numerous telegrams and letters on this subject. I have picked out 3 from my correspondence, because I received them today and because they come from 3 different quarters of my State. First, I read a telegram received this morning from the southeastern section of Colorado addressed to me:

ROCKY FORD, COLO., March 9, 1943.  
Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON,

Washington, D. C.:  
Say, Ed., who in Washington outranks a local draft board? Saturday by radio and Sunday by Associated Press we are told that local boards are to defer farm workers. It took a big load off my mind, and thought that all we had to do now was to go ahead and feed the Army. The time of the year to plant is here and we are all ready to start planting onions and beets and carrots. And now I am advised by the local draft board's attorney that the press report was baloney.

G. A. BLOTZ.

Mr. Blotz is well known to me as a farmer in the Arkansas Valley. He



farms a very large acreage, and is very sincere in his statements. I now read from a letter I received from Durango in the southwest corner of the State. The letter is addressed to me. The writer and her husband, who are engaged in the cattle business, applied for deferment for their son. The father is in bad health, and without the boy's help they cannot continue to produce beef on their farm. I read one of the paragraphs of the letter. It is addressed to me by Mrs. Wayne McCaw of Durango, Colo.:

John Craig, clerk of our local draft board, said that the farm draft-deferment talk was mostly propaganda or "candy coating to appease the farmers." He made light of the whole affair and said that all that is wanted is to defer the head of the farm family. If Mr. Craig is right, farmers and the general public certainly have been deceived. Business people here and other generally well informed people are under the impression that farmers and their sons and other farm workers are to be deferred. Just any number of people have said to us, "Your boy won't be called now—I see by the papers that all necessary farm workers are to be deferred."

The clerk of the local draft board says that deferment talk is "candy coating to appease the farmers."

I have a letter from my own section of the State, the northwest corner of the State. It is from R. F. Magor, Jr., who is president of the Western Slope Cattle Growers' Association, with headquarters at Rifle, Colo. I quote from the letter as follows:

It seems to me that there are a great many bartenders, clerks, restaurant workers, filling station men, and dozens of others whose jobs could be filled by women and these men could go to Army or defense plants, leaving experienced farm labor, whether married or single, to carry on production. I can't see the idea of sacrificing the livestock industry or farming industry at this time.

This is really becoming serious and production will show it next year. For instance, they have just taken another of my farm hands, who is feeding 800 cattle and cannot be replaced, in class A-1.

At present we are running 2,000 head of cattle, 9,600 sheep, and 350 hogs. I asked for exemption of only 4 men, one of them 36 years old and married. This one they just put in I-A is 1 of the 4. I don't see how I can run with any less experienced men. I have to step now to keep old men and cripples enough in to keep going.

And so on. These are recent letters. I could spend the day reading into the Record what is happening in my State.

I wish to concur in what has been said about the draft boards. They are composed of good and patriotic citizens, excellent businessmen, the finest kind of men. They are our neighbors, and they know about their communities. Unfortunately, however, in Colorado almost every board is made up entirely of professional and businessmen, lawyers, dentists, doctors, and others. Very few farmers are on the draft boards. Only in rare cases is a farmer found on one of the draft boards. A draft board receives an order from the State Selective Service Board that calls for a quota. The local board is told, "You have got to fill this quota." It is a temptation to them which they cannot resist; they have no way

of getting away from it. They take in one neighbor's boy, but here is another boy and they have to take him; they have no choice in the matter. They have to fill the quota and right now they are scraping the bottom of the barrel in order to fill the quota. It is only natural for them to take boys from the farm and send them away to the Army. A boy is not going to object.

So it is up to the Congress to meet this situation squarely and fairly. This bill does it. It takes the burden from the shoulders of the local selective service boards. They can depend upon the mandatory direction contained in this bill to answer the queries which will come to them from their neighbors and friends as to why they took one boy and did not take another. We must not leave this matter to their discretion because they are under too much pressure to stand up under that sort of a discretionary power. They have taken boys all over the country; now they are trying to stop, but it is pretty hard for them to stop; indeed they cannot do it. So if we are going to keep any boys on the farm at all, if we are going to make it possible for the farmers to continue operations we must put into the law a mandatory deferment provision for their protection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am so much concerned with the constantly changing views and continuously changing regulations of the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission that I want briefly to discuss a matter which is tearing at the heartstrings of millions of Americans.

Particularly disturbing, and none too clear to me, are the very recent announcements of the War Manpower Commission concerning farm labor, and news stories further referring to the drafting of married men. All of us are aware, Mr. President, that it is necessary in time of war that Government operate to a considerable extent on the basis of trial and error; and Heaven knows we have had our full share of that. No fair person would deny that in connection with the manufacture of the munitions of war and the rationing of food and other products and materials errors are unavoidable. We expected them, many of them, but I never expected, and I doubt that many others did, that we would practice the trial and error procedure to the extent that it has been followed with human beings. For month after month we have been kept in constant turmoil in connection with the drafting of men for service in the armed forces and in the handling of the manpower problem. And while this seemingly endless confusion has gone on men and women have suffered great mental anguish and wondered when their Government might adopt a policy that would permit them to make further plans for themselves and for their children. They want to know where they stand.

For all of the years that I have been a Member of Congress I have made it a practice to avoid indulging in personalities. I have avoided the criticism of in-

dividuals—and have ever been anxious to pass over unsound and unwise and sometimes silly statements and regulations or rulings. It has seemed to me that in time of war criticism for the sake of criticizing should be avoided, but I have never been unmindful of the fact that we here in the Senate are in the principal watchtower and that in the final analysis we are charged with all of the mistakes of the Federal Government. We have the power, as well as a solemn responsibility, and while war makes it necessary that we delegate great powers to the Chief Executive, which he in turn delegates to certain of the departments of Government, when there is evidence that the powers are being abused—or when mistakes are obvious—we are chiefly to blame if we do not insist upon the correction of the abuses or mistakes.

If we insist that all young men who have been engaged in agriculture or any other of the great industries of our country are to be denied active association with their fellow Americans of the armed forces, we undertake a procedure and policy that is not in keeping with the fundamental and sound and age-old practices of our Government.

There are tens of thousands of farm families in my State—and I am not in the least unmindful of our reliance upon agriculture. I know that if farmers were to organize as labor has organized and should take advantage of the force at their command regardless of consequences, the results might well be disastrous. But I anticipate no such attitude on the part of those solid Americans on whom America has so much depended for more than 300 years.

No man can make me believe that there is less patriotism on the farms than in the urban communities of our land, and none can make me believe that our farm problem can be adjusted only by placing the heaviest burden of war upon those who live in the cities, or that it is at this time necessary to promiscuously draft the heads of families in order to win the war. Most Senators know that thousands of young men from the farms have temporarily abandoned their agricultural pursuits to engage in the manufacture of the munitions of war. Is it fair, because of this migration from the farm, that only the city dweller, even though he has four or five children, shall engage in conflict? I fail to see wisdom or necessity in the proposal, and, while it may be the easy way from the standpoint of those who are writing the regulations, and giving the orders, I think that it is a grievous mistake for which we may never forgive ourselves unless we undertake to correct it at once. I cannot believe that those in charge of selective service, and the manpower problem, are unable to develop a more sound policy, if it can be called a policy, than has been practiced up to now.

It seems to me that it is possible to work out a plan whereby people in the cities, or near the farms, can contribute a portion of their time to agriculture. It will mean some inconvenience, of course, but there are thousands and thousands of people sufficiently skilled who can contribute a large part of their time to the

planting and harvesting of crops, and to the other farm work which must be carried on. Some time ago the President suggested that those below the draft ages could contribute, and although some disagreed with his opinion, I know that in my State, much to my regret, even little children have in the past done much work on farms. And every Senator knows that men and women not particularly skilled have harvested the crops in certain parts of our country for many, many years.

Mr. President, I will not now attempt to discuss the farm question in detail—because committees of the Senate are now devoting much of their time to that study—but I am particularly concerned with the great problem presented as it is proposed to call married men into the armed forces.

Earlier this year I engaged in correspondence with the Director of Selective Service on the question of drafting family men. At that time I expressed the view that, subject to military necessities, family men should not be called into the armed service while single men were still available. I also proposed that when and if it became necessary to take family men into the Army, it should be done on a sliding scale, with appropriate recognition given to the age of the family man and the number of his children.

I felt impelled to express these views because I had become convinced that under demands for an Army of great numbers, the Selective Service Act, enacted in peacetime, did not provide a rational basis for the orderly drafting of large groups of family men. The Selective Service Act was conceived as a method for providing military training to approximately 2,000,000 men a year during peacetime for the purpose of building up a reserve for time of war. But I doubt that any Member of the Senate at the time supposed that our armed forces, even in time of war, would ever exceed five or six million men.

Upon that basis, the mechanisms for selection as provided by the act seemed reasonable. We would have a registration of men within stated age limits. We would establish their order of call by a lottery, and then we would rely upon broad classifications of exemption to take care of the particular cases of hardship which the lottery system necessarily would create. If we were taking only 2,000,000 men a year out of a civilian population of in excess of 130,000,000, such a system could be made to work without disturbing dislocations of community or family life.

But what has happened within the 3 years which have intervened? We are now at war; and our obligations in that war are not merely to create the manpower necessary for a victorious Army and Navy, but also to feed in substantial measure a majority of the people of the civilized world not at war with us; to equip in great measure the armed forces of our allies; and to maintain this country as the heart of the great battle—a heart which must be kept pulsating strongly and regularly.

To be concrete, we are asked not only to man the greatest arsenal of warfare

the world has ever known, to man the creation and maintenance of the bread basket of the world, but also to build, equip, and maintain armed forces of our own which already are estimated in excess of 10,000,000 men.

These are gigantic, unprecedented tasks. They involve responsibilities which can be fulfilled only with a truly united America whose morale is not meanwhile shattered through the arbitrariness and, if I may say so, the ineptitude of a bureaucracy gone hog wild.

I am not passing judgment upon the decision of our military leaders. They continue to hold my confidence. I can realize that, especially in time of war, theirs is the responsibility for anticipating every emergency. I can understand that while molding divisions and tank forces for offensive operations, they must also be erecting new bulwarks of defense which probably never will be needed, but which if needed would be ready. I can realize, too, that in the far-flung strategy of this war, the United States becomes the hub—the nerve center—and the reservoir of ready reserves in men and equipment to be available for transport in all directions at once. I can even imagine that our salvation may ultimately be in our own national strength as a military power, and that for all the matériel and men we send to our allies, we must still keep here an undiminished nucleus of our own power.

With full recognition of these military necessities, I still am privileged, as a Member of the Senate, to question the methods which are announced to meet the undisclosed requirements.

For instance, having participated in the enactment of a peacetime Selective Service Act, I certainly am privileged to study the operation of that statute in time of war. And, since the recent announcement of the War Manpower Commission as to the imminence of drafting family men between the ages of 18 and 38, I have considered it my duty to study the proposals under which men shall now be taken from their children.

Do not consider for a moment that in these broader questions of national policy the military bureaus of this Capital City are endowed with an omniscience which is withheld from those of us who ponder the problems of the country in civilian roles.

When appropriate study and report are compatible with national welfare, I am certain that the headlong drafting of men over 38 years into the Army during the first year of the war will be shown to have been ridiculous. There is already testimony of our military leaders to support that statement. In spite of that testimony, they are going to try it again.

But why was the mistake made? In my opinion it was based in the short-sighted self-assurance of the Selective Service Bureau, which felt qualified to administer under stress of war a draft system designed for military training in peace. It seems that the same superabundance of self-assurance still exists. This time it appears to be in the War Manpower Commission.

I am afraid the same bureau is making still another such mistake in its now

rather hysterical warnings about the drafting of family men. I have read with great care the recent pronouncements of the War Manpower Commission and the public addresses of its spokesmen. I am mindful that as yet the list of so-called nonessential industries and enterprises and nondeferable occupations is small and covers hardly more than the obvious. But if the necessities for a large Army are truly stated, and if the statements are true that most family men of draft age will within the year be called upon to move either into essential work or be drafted into the armed service, then this list of nonessential occupations is going to grow very rapidly. And so, unless we are not being told the truth, the family men up to 38, or perhaps 45, years of age are today faced with the necessity of reorganizing their lives and the lives of their families right now.

Upon that basis I want to know how this Selective Service System is going to work. Let us consider a concrete example.

Under registration you have two men: One, 37 years old with six children; another 25 years old with one child. The family of each is wholly dependent for support upon the earnings of the father. If the man 37 years old with six children has a low number, he is drafted ahead of the man 25 years old with one child.

Is there any sensible person who believes that the mother of six dependent children should be required to shift for herself before the mother with one? I know that we cannot weigh family anxieties quantitatively, but I also know that it is easier under all the circumstances for the young mother with one child to make the unfortunate adjustments involved in this war than it is for the older mother with six children.

Yet, with all the press releases, the promulgation of rules and regulations, and the Nation-wide hook-ups, I have yet to be informed of how the Selective Service authorities intend to meet this question. I know that to local boards is delegated authority to make deferments in cases of hardship, but that is not enough. Our manpower draft is becoming so gigantic, so widespread, so pervasive in every community of the land, that if uniform regulations are not soon prepared, we of the Congress will have to legislate them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.  
Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say that, in addition to the inadequacy of the law as it presently exists, there may be in one county a great many single men and in the adjoining county there may be no single men, or comparatively few single men. Under such conditions one county would take married men with children and in the adjoining county married men with children would be exempt.

Mr. MALONEY. That is quite true.  
Mr. WHEELER. The same statement applies to States. In some States most of the single men have gone to work in factories. Possibly only married men



with children are left. Consequently married men with children in some States will be taken first, while in other States many single men will not be taken.

Mr. MALONEY. Even with all his great knowledge, I think the able Senator from Montana would be greatly surprised if he knew exactly how many tens of thousands—I dare say hundreds of thousands—of the young men from the farms of this country have turned their backs upon the farms to go into the munitions plants.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that is absolutely true.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, to me it is a relatively simple problem to solve. For instance, if we are to take married men, all family men between, let us say, the ages of 18 and 25, should be taken first. Within that group, those with the least number of children should be taken first. Then would follow the second age group, between 25 and 30, and finally the last group over 30. I fail to see where there is any complication in that very simple proposition.

It will be said that such a plan is unnecessarily complicated since all are to be taken within the year. Such a rejoinder seems to me to smack of the bureaucratic arbitrariness which is becoming this country's greatest political evil.

Let no bureaucrat tell me that even a year's deferment to a family man of 37 years with 6 dependent children is not something to be insisted upon.

I shall have more to say on this subject. It seems to me the time has come for a constructive survey of our Selective Service System. I ask each Senator to search his own experience, his own knowledge, and his own understanding, to find whether the following questions are answered to his satisfaction:

First. Have all available single men, uniformly in all parts of the country, been made properly subject to military call?

Second. Are the local draft boards functioning with sufficient freedom and, consequently, fairness?

Third. Are the millions in public service called as quickly and as readily to the Army as their fellow citizens in private life?

Fourth. Will the expanding list of nonessential industries and occupations include unnecessary governmental bureaus and offices as well as units of our private economy?

I have said before and I repeat with great emphasis: Our fighting morale will be measured by the common sense, the fairness and the honesty of our draft laws. The time has come when a committee of the Congress should look very carefully into the matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor. Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

#### CONDEMNATION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR OUTRAGES INFLICTED UPON CIVILIANS IN NAZI-OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, obviously the Senate cannot today finish

consideration of the bill now before it. I desire to have an executive session, and I also wish to have considered a concurrent resolution which I submitted last Friday. Therefore, I hope the consideration of the pending bill may be temporarily suspended.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, which is on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) as follows:

Whereas the American people view with indignation the atrocities inflicted upon the civilian population in the Nazi occupied countries, and especially the mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children; and

Whereas this policy of the Nazis has created a reign of terror, brutality, and extermination in Poland and other countries in Eastern and Central Europe; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That these brutal and indefensible outrages against millions of helpless men, women, and children should be, and they are hereby, condemned as unworthy of any nation or any regime which pretends to be civilized:

Resolved further, That the dictates of humanity and honorable conduct in war demand that this inexcusable slaughter and mistreatment shall cease and that it is the sense of this Congress that those guilty, directly or indirectly, of these criminal acts shall be held accountable and punished in a manner commensurate with the offenses for which they are responsible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say simply a word regarding the concurrent resolution. We are all familiar with the fact that the Nazis, under the pagan domination of Hitler, have brought about the slaughter of more than 2,000,000 Jews in occupied countries of Europe. There is in the world a total population of about 15,000,000 Jews. Six and a half million of them are in the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations, leaving approximately eight and one-half million in other countries. It is almost unbelievable that since the war was brought on by Hitler, more than 2,000,000 of these Jewish men, women, and children have been slaughtered—not killed in battle, but murdered, slaughtered outright—for no reason except that they are members of the Jewish race or religion. The Parliament of England recently adopted a resolution condemning that sort of conduct which does not conform with any honorable conception of warfare among nations. The Secretary of State last week issued a statement which called attention to the fact that the representatives of the United States and Great Britain are to meet soon in Ottawa to discuss this problem, with a view to trying to find some solution or remedy. Last week the Governor of New York set today as a day of mourning all over the State of New York for and on behalf of the 2,000,000 Jews who have been slaughtered by Hitler and by the Nazi regime. It seemed

to me appropriate that on this day the Senate of the United States should adopt a resolution condemning that sort of conduct. It is for that reason that I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1938, vice William M. Leiserson.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Stephen R. MacRae, from the State of North Carolina, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Wallace P. Studencki, from the State of Indiana, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Chicago regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Luke White, from the State of Indiana, to be senior attorney at \$4,600 per annum in the office of the general counsel of the War Manpower Commission;

Bernard L. Gorfinkle, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Russell C. McCarthy, from the State of New York, to be area director at \$5,600 per annum in the Rochester area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Wilberforce D. Simmons, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant at \$4,600 per annum in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Olaf K. Fjetland, from the State of Michigan, to be area director at \$4,600 per annum in the Saginaw area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Paul N. Devine, from the State of Maine, to be area director at \$4,600 per annum in the New Bedford-Fall River area office of the War Manpower Commission;

James K. Johnson, from the State of Ohio, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Cleveland regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Grafton L. Brown, from the State of Maryland, to be field supervisor at \$4,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Charlotte E. Carr, from the State of Illinois, to be assistant to the deputy chairman

at \$6,500 per annum in the War Manpower Commission.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Curtis L. Waller to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

**Mr. PEPPER.** I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### THURMAN W. ARNOLD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold to be associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

**Mr. LANGER.** Mr. President, I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold, but I desire the country to know that I do so with deepest reluctance and regret, because to me his elevation to the Court of Appeals is more like a funeral than a celebration.

It is my belief that no lawyer holding an official position in recent years has begun to approach the magnificent work which has been accomplished by Mr. Arnold as Assistant Attorney General of the United States. He comes from the State of Wyoming. He was educated in an eastern college and has lived in Washington for several years. He is conversant with the economic problems of the country. I agree with almost everything he has done except entering into consent decrees, and particularly those relating to the major oil companies.

Saddened as I am, nevertheless I realize that each man lives his own life. Mr. Arnold has made the decision that he desires this position, so who am I to say that I am right and he is wrong?

Only last week the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] delivered an address in the Senate against super-big-business monopolies following the war. Mr. Arnold deals with the subject in chapter 2 of his book entitled "Democracy and Free Enterprise," under the heading "The efficiency of industrial democracy."

Mr. President, I believe this chapter to be the greatest which has ever come from the pen of Thurman Arnold. I believe it should be made compulsory reading in every high school and college in America. I ask that the chapter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the chapter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DEMOCRACY AND FREE ENTERPRISE

##### II. THE EFFICIENCY OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

This war has often been described as a struggle between capitalism and totalitarian economy. In the past few years totalitarian economy, judged on the basis of results without regard for the desirability of the means, has been a better producer than the capitalis-

tic system. And thus arises the myth of totalitarian efficiency.

Yet, if we analyze this so-called totalitarian efficiency, we find that our capitalistic economy, with all its faults, was always more efficient in the techniques of production than Germany. Our industrial technicians had outstripped those of every other country in the world. We had greater production per man-hour of labor than any other country in the world. In other words our capitalistic economy was not less efficient in production; it was lagging behind in spite of the fact that it was more efficient. This is a paradox that needs explanation.

The answer, as I see it, is that we were suffering from an economic disease which is endemic in all commercial civilization—the disease of cartelization, or hardening of the arteries of commerce. The cause of that disease is the desire of the leaders of industry to protect themselves against new enterprise. They have struggled to the top after exhausting efforts. They want to make their achievement permanent. They feel they need a rest. Therefore, they think that it is their right to stop newcomers from getting into the charmed circle and bothering them. The stuff which newcomers have to sell at prices which endanger their dividends is called a surplus, or distress production. The only way to get rid of that surplus is to keep newcomers from producing. But you can't stop newcomers from producing in order to stabilize their price structure unless you organize and merge and then organize and merge all over again. It takes a lot of power to stabilize the economy in a new enterprise. For example, in 1920, 25 percent of copper was produced by three companies in the United States. In 1930, 40 percent was concentrated in the same hands. Today the three companies control 81 percent. It took that much concentration of power to stabilize copper prices and eliminate the surplus. Incidentally, it was also necessary for the cartel to combine with Chilean interests and control the foreign market. Without these superhuman efforts, extending all over the world, our present shortage would not have been possible. It was all done by business leaders who thought that surplus spelled economic disaster.

In the same way the disease of cartelization progressed in other industries; concentration grew to an alarming extent, particularly in the basic materials which are the source of all industrial production. The building up of these organizations did more than simply create shortages in basic war materials. It led to the development of an economy divided into two economic worlds.

The first was the world of organized industry; the second was the world of small, unorganized businessmen, farmers, laborers, and consumers. In the first world, there was the power to maintain high prices no matter how much the demand for the product fell off. When this power was exercised, purchasing power was curtailed, production dropped, men were laid off. This, in turn, lowered purchasing power and made demand drop still further. A vicious downward spiral was set in operation. In the second world, unlimited competition still existed and could not be controlled. In this world lived the farmers, retailers, and small businessmen who supply the consumers with both goods and labor. Here, when the supply increased or the demand fell off, prices dropped to the bottom, but the people went right on producing as much as the conditions of the market would permit. In the first world we had concentrated control, which makes possible high and rigid prices. These, in turn, led to restriction of production and wholesale discharge of labor. In the second world, we found competition among these groups, low flexible prices, large production, and labor standards often at starvation levels.

The final result, before the unbalanced industrial boom created by the present war, has nowhere been better described than by President Roosevelt in his monopoly message of 1935. He said:

"Statistics of the Bureau of Internal Revenue reveal the following amazing figures for 1935:

"Ownership of corporate assets: Of all corporations reporting from every part of the Nation, one-tenth of 1 percent of them owned 52 percent of the assets of all of them.

"And to clinch the point: Of all corporations reporting, less than 5 percent of them owned 87 percent of all the assets of all of them.

"Income and profits of corporations: Of all the corporations reporting from every part of the country, one-tenth of 1 percent of them earned 50 percent of the net income of all of them.

"And to clinch the point: Of all the manufacturing corporations reporting, less than 4 percent of them earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all of them."

All this is history. It is an old story to the farmers of this country. However, I present it as background, since it bears on the economic problem which the present has forced on the unorganized industries of this country. Billions of dollars had to be poured into this unbalanced economic structure under the pressure of sheer immediate necessity. This necessity brought into sharp relief how our antiproducer monopoly control had been working.

We suddenly woke up to find acute shortages in every basic noncompetitive industry. We are short of power in a country abounding in power; we are short of metals and chemicals; we are short of transportation; we are short of skilled labor. In every industry which has been able to restrict supply in order to put a floor under prices, we find a lack of capacity. This lack of capacity is not hurting the industries which are responsible for these shortages. The burden is being borne entirely by independent businessmen and farmers whose supplies are being cut off by the imposition of priorities.

Prior to the war America had developed the greatest industrial efficiency and skill in the world. When war broke out it was handicapped in the use of that efficiency only because of a lack of basic materials—which would have been just as useful in building cheap houses for the city or cheap equipment for the farm as for tanks and airplanes. In other words, failure to fill housing and farm needs in peace was one of the reasons why we were short of materials in war.

For years, our economic system and that of the British had been overwhelmingly concerned with preserving the security and the income of established and dominant groups. These groups stifled new productive enterprise in order to protect themselves against competition. They limited their own output to prevent what they called "a surplus." They failed to expand their productive capacity because they feared expansion might lead to future competition or future surpluses. They were afraid of industrial plenty, which alone can give a nation wealth in peace or strength in war.

Let me illustrate. In 1931 there was a growing world surplus of aluminum which threatened to invade American markets and disturb the monopoly control and the price structure of the Aluminum Co. of America. So that company formed a Canadian affiliate called Aluminum Limited, thinking that in this way it could escape the antitrust laws and could join with the aluminum monopolies of other countries to prevent threatened world competition by eliminating the surplus. World production was drastically limited to prevent new surpluses. Minimum world prices were fixed.

The plan to keep up prices by restricting world production rolled merrily along, until



Hitler came into power. He had no patience with any limitation on German production, but he was delighted with the idea of limiting production abroad. And so Hitler, in return for permission to produce unlimited quantities at home, promised that he would not increase his exports and thus disturb the world prices which the cartels were trying to maintain. And so the democracies were free to pursue their policy of eliminating what they foolishly thought was a dangerous domestic surplus without fear of invasion of their markets by German competition. Under this arrangement, Hitler doubled and tripled aluminum production for aircraft and war materials. The democracies stood still. When the war came, Germany was producing one-third to one-half more aluminum than America.

Even the collapse of France failed to wake up the aluminum industry to the dangerous shortage which its policy of limiting production had created. In 1940, when the Antitrust Division was attempting to prove a shortage of aluminum for war needs, the Aluminum Co. of America denied it. Wishful thinkers in industry, instinctively fearing over-production of basic materials, swallowed these statements with relief. And thus the pressure to build up competing production was momentarily relieved.

Now we know there is a shortage, but we could have saved precious time and precious materials had we not listened to the wishful thinking of the men whose financial interest lay in preventing new production in order to preserve their monopoly control after the war.

In 1940 steel was already running from 92 to 97 percent of capacity. But those in control of the industry did not like to think of a coming shortage, because it meant that we should have to build new plants, each of which, after the war, would be a competitive threat to the orderly control of the industry by those already established in it.

In other words, perhaps we had better not build up the steel production that we so imperatively need today because it might give steel to buyers of automobiles and tin cans and steel construction at too low prices after the war. Steel companies during the war should not be expected to expand plants which might hurt their dividends after the war.

Not only did cartelization create an unbalanced economy between different groups of producers and consumers, it also prevented the development of the resources of the South and West. It created a geographical unbalance of our economy as well as an unbalance between farmers and industry.

For the past 20 years the economy of the South and West has been developing along colonial lines. The industrial East has been the mother country. The South and West have been the colonies. The colonies have furnished the mother country with raw material. The mother country has been exploiting the colonies by selling them manufactured necessities at artificially controlled prices. New York City has been the financial and industrial center of the Nation. The industrial East has been the principal source of both capital and organization to develop the South and West. Under such conditions, it has been natural enough that the South and West have been developed in a way which would contribute the most to the domination of the industrial East. Wherever it has interfered with eastern industrial domination, the competitive energy of the South and West has been stifled. Local independent capital in the South and West has been gradually disappearing. Local independent enterprise has been under a constant handicap. The farmer has been the chief victim.

How all this happened is a complicated process. Big business has treated the West

and South primarily as a source of raw materials, not as a place to manufacture and sell finished products at competitive prices. This is the age-old principle of colonial empires. It is dictated by the necessity of keeping up dividends in the mother country against cheaper local competition in the colonies. The methods of maintaining control of industrial markets in the South and West are based on the power of tightly organized cartels to control supply, transportation, and distribution in such a way as to put new competing enterprise in the colonies under a continuing handicap. I will illustrate by taking a few examples from the field of transportation.

In Pueblo, Colo., there is a steel plant capable of producing a million tons a year. Such a plant in a free economy would give the farmers and consumers of the West bar steel and nails at less cost, because it would eliminate the transportation charges from Chicago. But the plant was not built for the development of the West. It is, on the contrary, operated in such a way as to preserve the dominant position of eastern steel. A farmer in Colorado who wished to buy steel bars in Pueblo had to pay \$20.38 a ton imaginary freight from Chicago. If he wished to buy a keg of wire nails he paid nearly \$1 a crate for phantom freight for a product manufactured in his own home State. In other words, he was not permitted to have any advantage from the local industry.

So much for the consumer. How about the development of more steel production in Pueblo? If the Pueblo plant wished to ship steel 50 miles east of Pueblo, the consumer paid as much for transportation as if he bought in Chicago. The whole market in the Mountain States was thus preserved for eastern industry.

In using the basing-point system as an example of price control, I do not wish to over-emphasize it. It is only one of the methods by which a few dominant concerns control the market for necessities, and is probably not the most important. The price of gasoline, for example, was controlled in part by the basing-point system. It was also controlled by the illegal use of the ethyl patents—by large oil companies' forming pools to remove competitive gasoline from the markets—by the ownership of pipe lines by major oil companies so that they might obtain rebates which would make it impossible for independents to ship on equal terms. These controls operated against the unorganized South and West in two ways: first, organized industry fixed the prices which the South and West got for their raw materials; second, it fixed the price which consumers paid for necessities. In addition to fixing prices, big business by the sheer power of large resources was able to force independents into line. This became known as price leadership, maintained, not by open conspiracy but by the fear of retaliation.

The disease of cartelization does not stop with industry. It is responsible for most of the labor practices which we now condemn labor for forcing on employers. Faced with an irreducible minimum of unemployment, labor got the idea that it was part of its function to aid in reducing the surplus which threatened the existence of its jobs. Nationwide labor organizations began to force useless and parasitic labor on employers. They adopted a policy of resisting more efficient methods of production. For the first time in the history of the United States the idea that it was legitimate for labor to sabotage production in the interest of static jobs was recognized by the courts. The Supreme Court held that it was not an unreasonable restraint of trade for a labor union in Chicago to prevent the consumers of Chicago from having ready-mixed concrete, thereby lowering the quality of concrete and raising

the cost of building in that city. As a result of such practices the development of cheaper housing has been stifled in this country. The Court arrives at the approval of such practices in a circuitous way.

In 1939 a six-room house in Cleveland cost \$1,000 more to build than the same house in Detroit. Responsible citizens reported to the Antitrust Division at the time that one of the reasons was that contractors who used prefabricated material or more economical methods were afraid to do business in Cleveland.

Who got that extra thousand dollars? The answer is that nobody got it. They just stopped building houses. In 1939 there was only \$21,000,000 in Federal Housing Authority loans for houses in Cleveland. There was \$59,000,000 in Federal Housing Authority loans in Detroit. Not even organized labor profited. The hourly wage for carpenters was higher in Cleveland than it was in Detroit. The annual income of carpenters was higher in Detroit than it was in Cleveland. Such exploitation is going on all over the country. Take a few examples at random. In Chicago a building-trades concern would not let stone which had been cut in Indiana be used. It had to be shipped in rough and cut in Chicago. Uncut stone costs 20 percent more to ship. So Chicago's freight bill goes up. Indiana is better equipped to cut stone than Chicago, so manufacturing costs go up. The stonecutters' union in Indiana, probably because of its greater efficiency in the process, gets higher wages than the Chicago union, so labor as a whole gets less wages. The result is higher building costs and less consumer purchasing power.

This idea of erecting a local protective tariff against outside products is always attractive to those who can control imports, and so it spreads rapidly. In Pittsburgh and San Francisco the carpenters' union would not allow outside millwork to be used in construction. In New York metal lathers won't allow the use of metal laths and metal rods which are not fabricated or bent on the job or in the city. In Belleville, Ill., the unions have been indicted with dealers and contractors for preventing the home owner from building a house when the structural parts are prefabricated. In Houston, Tex., master plumbers and the plumbing union insisted that pipe made for particular jobs would not be installed unless the thread were cut off and removed from the pipe and a new thread were put on at the job. They insisted that brass pipe had to be delivered without a thread on either end. This sort of thing would be funny if it were not so expensive to people on low incomes who have to cut down their food bills in order to pay higher rents.

The distribution of food in large cities is full of log-jams between the farm and the table. The teamsters in Washington, with the cheerful acquiescence of those retailers anxious to raise the price of necessities, threatened to cut off deliveries from stores selling a larger loaf of bread unless they raised their prices 40 percent. Consumers cannot protest against that beginning of a monopoly price spiral in food by refusing to buy bread and eating cake. These are quiet, peaceful holdups, as painless as a hidden sales tax. The consumer never has a chance to wire Washington to send a board of prominent men to argue on his behalf. The fight is all over before the referee can get to the scene of the trouble. You can mediate a struggle between the Bethlehem Steel Co. and an organized union. You can't mediate a struggle between consumers and the teamsters, because the consumers are down and out before the first gong rings.

Why was labor able to prevent legislation which curbed these practices? One of the reasons was that most of them were done in combination with a strong industrial group. In restricting the distribution of the milk

they had the cooperation of powerful dairy companies who did not like store delivery any more than labor did. In the distribution of plumbing they had the cooperation of great plumbing manufacturers who feared the direct selling of Sears, Roebuck. For example, in the recent indictment in the hat industry, the Government charges that a group of manufacturers joined with the unions in order to prevent milliners from converting their efforts into the production of hats for the Army. They divided the business up, they set the price, they put handicaps on any new enterprise that desired to bid. The idea of the union was to keep up their wages by restricting the manufacture of hats to people with whom they already had an agreement. The idea of the hatters was to control the manufacture of hats for the Army. Therefore, industrialists were unable to make the same kind of a whole-hearted drive to put labor under the anti-trust laws that they did in attacking the Holding Company Act. Their ranks were divided. The cartel groups were profiting from labor restrictions. Or else they were in a noncompetitive position which enabled them to pass the cost of inefficiency on to the public.

In this situation economic thought turned in two directions. Few economic thinkers, however, put any particular emphasis on stopping the disease which was creating these results. Liberals and radicals alike turned to a vague idea that the remedy lay in a planned economy. Now, of course, no Government group or industrial group can exist without making plans. However, these thinkers did not have any specific plans in mind. They were basing their faith in the thought that a set of experts could be selected who would understand the whole matter and make the plans for them. The treatises of the time on the economic health of the Nation spent most of their time pointing out the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, of idle capital and idle labor. Surely, they said, wise men if put in charge would not permit such things to happen. Therefore, let us get back of the movement to support boards of experts in the Government who will balance production and distribution.

Faced with this sort of thing big business became apoplectic. It was the antithesis of individualism. It was the Russian system of government. Big business believed in managers rather than planners. These managers were the heads of the great industrial cartels. All we needed to do was to let them alone and they would get rid of the distressing surplus for us.

Under constant attack the energy of the planners died down. And then, for the first time, we began to drive along the traditional lines that have made us a great industrial democracy. The President in his remarkable message in 1938 decided on a campaign against the cartel system, which in this country is ordinarily referred to as "monopoly." That tradition consists not in hiring experts to make broad general plans but in breaking up, one at a time, the restraints on production and distribution of goods. There is nothing in it which is antithetical to any particular plan relating to any particular industrial activity. It does assume, however, that legislative plans should be adapted to specific evils and that the future of industrial democracy does not lie in any more Government control than is required to remedy specific evils. It believes that in the long run the most efficient production and distribution of goods will come from private initiative in a free market. It is based on the premise that most of our troubles have come because we have allowed private groups to protect themselves against the inconvenience of being forced to compete with new enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold to be Associate Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Arnold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH MEXICO

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive D (77th Cong., 2d sess.), a Consular Convention between the United States of America and Mexico, signed at Mexico City, on August 12, 1942, which was read the second time, as follows:

#### CONSULAR CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The President of the United States of America and the President of the United Mexican States, being desirous of defining the duties, rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territory of the other country, have decided to conclude a convention for

that purpose and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

George S. Messersmith, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Mexico, and

The President of the United Mexican States:

Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Relations;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

#### ARTICLE I

1. Each High Contracting Party agrees to receive from the other High Contracting Party, consular officers in those of its ports, places, and cities, where it may be convenient and which are open to consular representatives of any foreign States.

2. Consular officers of each High Contracting Party shall, after entering upon their duties, enjoy reciprocally in the territories of the other High Contracting Party all the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities which are enjoyed by consular officers of the same grade of the most favored nation, there being understood by consular officers Consuls General as well as Consuls and Vice Consuls who are not honorary. As official agents, such officers shall be entitled to the high consideration of all officials, national or local, with whom they have official intercourse in the State which receives them.

3. The Government of each High Contracting Party shall furnish free of charge the necessary exequatur of such consular officers of the other High Contracting Party as present a regular commission signed by the chief executive of the appointing State and under its great seal; and shall issue to a subordinate or substitute consular officer duly appointed by an accepted superior consular officer with the approbation of his Government, or by any other competent officer of his Government, such documents as according to the laws of the respective States shall be requisite for the exercise by the appointee of the consular function; provided in either case that the person applying for an exequatur or other document is found acceptable. In the exhibition of an exequatur, or other document in lieu thereof issued to a subordinate or substitute consular officer, such consular officer or such subordinate or substitute consular officer, as the case may be, shall be permitted to perform his duties and to enjoy the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities granted by this Convention.

4. Upon the death, incapacity, or absence of a consular officer having no subordinate consular officer at his post, secretaries or chancellors, whose official character may previously have been made known to the Government of the State in the territory of which the consular function was exercised, may temporarily exercise the consular functions of the deceased or incapacitated or absent consular officers; and while so acting shall enjoy all the rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities that were granted to the consular officer.

5. A consular officer or a diplomatic officer of either High Contracting Party, a national of the State by which he is appointed and duly commissioned or accredited by such State, may, in the capital of the other State, have the rank also of a diplomatic officer or of a consular officer, as the case may be, provided that and for so long as permission for him to exercise such dual functions has been duly granted by the Government of the State in the territory of which he exercises his functions as a consular officer and to which he is accredited as a diplomatic officer, and provided further that in any such case the rank as a diplomatic officer shall be under-



stood as being superior to and independent of the rank as a consular officer.

#### ARTICLE II

1. Consular officers, nationals of the State by which they are appointed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from arrest in such territory except when charged with the commission of an act designated by local legislation as crime other than misdemeanor and subjecting the individual guilty thereof to punishment by imprisonment. Such officers shall be exempt from military billeting, and from service of any military or naval, administrative or police character whatsoever.

2. In criminal cases the attendance at court by a consular officer as a witness may be demanded by the plaintiff, the defendant, or the judge. The demand shall be made with all possible regard for the consular dignity and the duties of the office; and there shall be compliance on the part of the consular officer.

3. In civil, contentious-administrative and labor cases, consular officers shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts of the State which receives them. When the testimony of a consular officer who is a national of the State which appoints him and who is not engaged in any private occupation for gain is taken in civil cases, it shall be taken orally or in writing at his residence or office and with due regard for his convenience. The officer should, however, voluntarily give his testimony at the opportune moment of the trial whenever it is possible to do so without serious interference with his official duties.

4. A consular officer shall not be required to testify in criminal, contentious-administrative, labor or civil cases, regarding acts performed by him in his official capacity.

#### ARTICLE III

1. Consular officers and employees in a consulate, nationals of the State by which they are appointed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from all taxes, National, State, provincial and municipal, including taxes on fees, wages or salaries received specifically in compensation for consular services, and they shall be exempt from all kinds of charges incident to the licensing, registration, use or circulation of vehicles. However, they shall not be exempt from taxes levied on account of the possession or ownership of immovable property situated within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions or taxes levied against income derived from property of any kind situated within such territory or belonging thereto.

2. The exemptions provided in paragraph 1 of this Article shall apply equally to other officials who are duly appointed by one of the High Contracting Parties to exercise official functions in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, provided that such officials shall be nationals of the State appointing them and shall not be engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions; and provided further that permission for them to exercise such official functions has been duly granted by the Government of the receiving State. The Government of the State appointing such officials shall communicate to the Government of the receiving State satisfactory evidence of the appointment and shall indicate the character of the services which will be performed by the officials to whom the exemptions are intended to apply.

#### ARTICLE IV

1. Each High Contracting Party agrees to permit the entry free of all duty of all furni-

ture, equipment and supplies intended for official use in the consular offices of the other High Contracting Party, and to extend to such consular officers of the other High Contracting Party as are its nationals and to such members of their families and suites as are its nationals, the privilege of entry free of duty of their baggage and all other personal property whether accompanying the officer or his family or suite to his post or imported at any time during his incumbency thereof; provided, nevertheless, that there shall not be brought into the territories of either High Contracting Party any article, the importation of which is prohibited by the law of such High Contracting Party, until requirements in accordance with the appropriate law have been duly met.

2. The exemptions provided in paragraph 1 of this Article shall apply equally to other officials who are duly appointed by one of the High Contracting Parties to exercise official functions in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, provided that such officials shall be nationals of the State appointing them. The Government of the State appointing such officials shall communicate to the Government of the receiving State satisfactory evidence of the appointment and shall indicate the character of the services which are to be performed by the officials to whom the exemptions are intended to apply.

3. It is understood, however, that the exemptions provided in this Article shall not be extended to consular officers or other officials who are engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State to which they have been appointed or in which they exercise their functions, save with respect to Governmental supplies.

#### ARTICLE V

1. Consular officers may place over the outer door of their respective offices the arms of their State with an appropriate inscription designating the nature of the office, and they may place the coat of arms and fly the flag of their State on automobiles employed by them in the exercise of their consular functions. Such officers may also fly the flag of their State on their offices, including those situated in the capitals of the respective countries. They may likewise fly such flag over any boat or vessel employed in the exercise of the consular functions.

2. The quarters where consular business is conducted, correspondence to which the official seal of the consulates is affixed, and the archives of the consulate shall at all times be inviolable, and under no pretext shall any authorities of any character of the State in which such quarters or archives are located make any examination or seizure of papers or other property in such quarters or archives or to which the official seal is affixed. When consular officers are engaged in business within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, the files and documents of the consulate shall be kept in a place entirely separate from the place where private or business papers are kept. Consular offices shall not be used as places of asylum. No consular officers shall be required to produce official archives in court or to testify as to their contents.

#### ARTICLE VI

1. Consular officers of either High Contracting Party may, within their respective consular districts, address the authorities, National, State, Provincial or Municipal, for the purpose of protecting the nationals of the State by which they were appointed in the enjoyment of rights accruing by treaty or otherwise. Complaint may be made for the infraction of those rights. Failure upon the part of the proper authorities to grant redress or to accord protection may justify interposition through the diplomatic channel, and

in the absence of a diplomatic representative, a consul general or the consular officer stationed at the capital may apply directly to the Government of the country.

2. Consular officers shall, within their respective consular districts, have the right:

(a) to interview and communicate with the nationals of the State which appointed them;

(b) to inquire into any incidents which have occurred affecting the interests of the nationals of the State which appointed them;

(c) upon notification to the appropriate authority, to visit any of the nationals of the State which appointed them who are imprisoned or detained by authorities of the State; and

(d) to assist the nationals of the State which appointed them in proceedings before or relations with authorities of the State.

3. Nationals of either High Contracting Party shall have the right at all times to communicate with the consular officers of their country.

#### ARTICLE VII

1. Consular officers, in pursuance of the laws of their respective countries, may, within their respective districts:

(a) take and attest the depositions of any person whose identity they have duly established;

(b) authenticate signatures;

(c) draw up, attest, certify and authenticate unilateral acts, translations, testamentary dispositions, and transcripts of civil registry of the nationals of the State which has appointed the consular officer; and

(d) draw up, attest, certify and authenticate deeds, contracts, documents and written instruments of any kind, provided that such deeds, contracts, documents and written instruments shall have application, execution, and legal effect primarily in the territory of the State which shall have appointed the consular officer.

2. Instruments and documents thus executed and copies and translations thereof, when duly authenticated by the consular officer, under his official seal, shall be received as evidence in the territories of either State, as original documents or authenticated copies, as the case may be, and shall have the same force and effect as if drawn up or executed before a notary or other public officer duly authorized in the State by which the consular officer was appointed; provided, always, that such documents shall have been drawn and executed in conformity to the laws and regulations of the State where they are designed to take effect.

#### ARTICLE VIII

1. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, without having in the locality of his decease any known heirs or testamentary executors by him appointed, the competent local authorities shall at once inform the nearest consular officer of the State of which the deceased was a national of the fact of his death, in order that necessary information may be forwarded to the persons interested.

2. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, without will or testament whereby he has appointed testamentary executors, the consular officer of the State of which the deceased was a national and within whose district the deceased made his home at the time of death, shall, so far as the laws of the country permit and pending the appointment of an administrator and until letters of administration have been granted, be deemed qualified to take charge of the property left by the decedent for the preservation and protection of such property. Such consular officer shall have the right to be

appointed as administrator within the discretion of a court or other agency controlling the administration of estates, provided the laws of the place where the estate is administered so permit.

3. Whenever a consular officer accepts the office of administrator of the estate of a deceased countryman, he subjects himself in that capacity to the jurisdiction of the court or other agency making the appointment for all necessary purposes to the same extent as if he were a national of the State by which he has been received.

#### ARTICLE IX

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall within his district have the right to appear personally or by authorized representative in all matters concerning the administration and distribution of the estate of a deceased person under the jurisdiction of the local authorities, for all such heirs or legatees in the estate, either minors or adults, as may be nonresidents of the country and nationals of the State by which the consular officer was appointed, unless such heirs or legatees have appeared, either in person or by authorized representatives.

2. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party may on behalf of his non-resident countrymen collect and receipt for their distributive shares derived from estates in process of probate or accruing under the provisions of so-called Workmen's Compensation Laws or other like statutes, for transmission through channels prescribed by his Government to the proper distributees, provided that the court or other agency making distribution through him may require him to furnish reasonable evidence of the remission of the funds to the distributees.

#### ARTICLE X

1. A consular officer shall have exclusive jurisdiction over controversies arising out of the internal order of private vessels of his country, and shall alone exercise jurisdiction in situations, wherever arising, between officers and crews, pertaining to the enforcement of discipline on board, provided the vessel and the persons charged with wrongdoing shall have entered territorial waters or a port within his consular district. Consular officers shall also have jurisdiction over issues concerning the adjustment of wages and the execution of labor contracts of the crews; provided that their intervention will have a conciliatory character, without authority to settle disputes which may arise. This jurisdiction shall not exclude the jurisdiction conferred on the respective local authorities under existing or future laws of the place.

2. When an act committed on board a private vessel under the flag of the State by which the consular officer has been appointed and within the territory or the territorial waters of the State by which he has been received constitutes a crime according to the laws of the receiving State, subjecting the person guilty thereof to punishment as a criminal, the consular officer shall not exercise jurisdiction except in so far as he is permitted to do so by the local law.

3. A consular officer may freely invoke the assistance of the local police authorities in any matter pertaining to the maintenance of internal order on board a vessel under the flag of his country within the territory or the territorial waters of the State by which he has been received, and upon such request the requisite assistance shall be given.

4. A consular officer may appear with the officers and crews of vessels under the flag of his country before the judicial authorities of the State by which he has been received for the purpose of observing proceedings or of rendering assistance as an interpreter or agent.

#### ARTICLE XI

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall have the right to inspect within the ports of the other High Contracting Party within his consular district, the private vessels of any flag destined to and about to clear for ports of his country, for the sole purpose of observing the sanitary conditions and measures taken on board such vessels, in order that he may be enabled thereby to execute intelligently bills of health and other documents required by the laws of his country and to inform his Government concerning the extent to which its sanitary regulations have been observed at ports of departure by vessels destined to one of its ports, with a view to facilitating entry of such vessels, provided that the captain of the vessel shall have requested of the consular officer the issuance or visa of the appropriate bill of health.

2. In exercising the right conferred upon them by this Article, consular officers shall act with all possible despatch and without unnecessary delay.

#### ARTICLE XII

1. All proceedings relative to the salvage of vessels of either High Contracting Party wrecked upon the coasts of the other High Contracting Party shall be directed by the consular officer of the country to which the vessel belongs and within whose district the wreck may have occurred, or by some other person authorized for such purpose by the law of such country and whose identity shall be made known to the local authorities by the consular officer.

2. The local authorities of the receiving State shall immediately inform the consular officer, or the other authorized person to whom reference is made in the foregoing paragraph, of the occurrence, and shall in the meantime take all necessary measures for the protection of persons and the preservation of the wrecked property. Such authorities shall intervene only to maintain order, to protect the interests of the salvors, if the salvors do not belong to the crew of the wrecked vessel, and to ensure the execution of the arrangements which shall be made for the entry and exportation of the salvaged merchandise, such merchandise not to be subjected to any customs charges unless intended for subsequent consumption in the country where the wreck has occurred.

3. When the wreck occurs within a port, there shall be observed also those arrangements which may be ordered by the local authorities with a view to avoiding any damage that might otherwise be caused thereby to the port and to other ships.

4. The intervention of the local authorities shall occasion no expense of any kind to the owners or operators of the vessels, except such expenses as may be caused by the operations of salvage and the preservation of the goods saved, together with expenses that would be incurred under similar circumstances by vessels of the country.

#### ARTICLE XIII

Honorary Consuls or Vice Consuls, as the case may be, shall enjoy, in addition to all the rights, privileges, exemptions, immunities and obligations enjoyed by honorary consular officers of the same rank of the most favored nation, those rights, privileges, exemptions, immunities and obligations provided for in paragraph 3 of article I and in articles V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, and XII of the present Convention, for which they have received authority in conformity to the laws of the State by which they are appointed.

#### ARTICLE XIV

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged in the City of Mexico.

The Convention shall take effect in all its provisions the thirtieth day after the day of the exchange of ratifications and shall continue in force for the term of five years.

2. If, six months before the expiration of the aforesaid period of five years, the Government of neither High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the Government of the other High Contracting Party of an intention of modifying by change or omission any of the provisions of any of the Articles of this Convention or of terminating the Convention upon the expiration of the aforesaid period of five years the Convention shall continue in effect after the aforesaid period and until six months from the date on which the Government of either High Contracting Party shall have notified to the Government of the other High Contracting Party an intention of modifying or terminating the Convention.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, in the City of Mexico, on this 12th day of the month of August, 1942.

G. S. MESSERSMITH [SEAL]  
E. PADILLA [SEAL]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations very carefully considered the convention, and reported it favorably. I do not oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive D, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Mexico defining the duties, rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territory of the other country, signed at Mexico City on August 12, 1942.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. (Putting the question.) Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9, 1943:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Fritz A. M. Alfsen, of New York.  
Aubrey E. Lippincott, of Arizona.  
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.



## WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Albert L. Nickerson, from the State of Massachusetts, to be Director, Bureau of Placement, at \$8,000 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Denton O. Rushing, from the State of Arkansas, to be field supervisor, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Joseph Earl Smith, from the State of Ohio, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Youngstown area office of the War Manpower Commission (vice Marion A. Gregg, transferred).

Lorentz E. Wormley, from the State of California, to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Portland area office of the War Manpower Commission.

## POSTMASTERS

## FLORIDA

Evelyn C. Hunter, Neptune Beach, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## GEORGIA

Mack B. Smith, Drybranch, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elvis L. Hopper, Hapeville, Ga., in place of W. R. Conline, resigned.

Stephen C. Tate, Tate, Ga., in place of Maynard Mashburn, resigned.

## ILLINOIS

Webster Hanna, Noble, Ill., in place of G. G. Martin, deceased.

## KENTUCKY

Carolyn V. Ducker, Butler, Ky., in place of C. O. Ducker, resigned.

## LOUISIANA

Clinton C. Barron, Lillie, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## MARYLAND

Mary Estelle Ennis, Joppa, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Patrick J. Connelly, Boston, Mass., in place of P. F. Tague, deceased.

## OKLAHOMA

Monroe Burton, Poteau, Okla., in place of Monroe Burton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## OREGON

Paul A. Mills, Woodburn, Oreg., in place of H. F. Butterfield, removed.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9, 1943:

## THE JUDICIARY

## UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Curtis L. Waller to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Thurman W. Arnold to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER FROM THE INDICATED DATES

Leonard C. Johnson from March 1, 1943.

John Bowie, Jr., from March 1, 1943.

Ector B. Latham from March 1, 1943.

George R. Shelton from March 16, 1943.

Ira T. Sanders from March 24, 1943.

Edward R. McCarthy from March 24, 1943.

Francis B. Quinn from March 24, 1943.

Emil H. Kirsch from March 26, 1943.

LXXXIX—110

## IN THE ARMY

## APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## To Finance Department

First Lt. Percival Stanley Brown

## To Air Corps

Second Lt. Leroy Hugh Watson, Jr.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## To be colonels, Medical Corps

Edward Augustus Coates, Jr.

James Albertus Bethea

Asa Margrave Lehman

Orauel Henry Stanley

Sewell Munson Corbett

Samuel Relly Norris

Benjamin Norris

## To be captains, Medical Corps

David Paul Ward

Edwin Emmons Corcoran

## To be colonels, Veterinary Corps

Allen Chamberlain Wight

Elwood Luke Nye

## CHAPLAINS

## To be captains

Roger Dace Russell

John Frederick Gaertner

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

## APPOINTMENTS

## To be second lieutenants

John F. Coffey

Andrew M. Zimmer

William F. Mazlack

Richard A. Kelly

Preston S. Marchant

Jackson C. Turnacliff

## POSTMASTERS

## MISSOURI

Morris D. Greenwood, Fredericktown.

John H. Dickbrader, Washington.

## OKLAHOMA

William T. Gaddis, Catoosa.

## WISCONSIN

Frances A. Hollister, Clinton.

George C. Smith, Downing.

William L. Lee, Drummond.

Alphonse J. McGuire, Highland.

Leone E. De Muth, Hollandale.

Letha G. Sherman, North Prairie.

Minnie O. Bartelme, Okauchee.

Louis H. Schultz, Reedsburg.

Grover E. Falck, Seymour.

Louis H. Rivard, Turtle Lake.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we pray that we may love Thy ways with the full force of decision and purpose. In all crises let it be our settled aim to watch, lest any idol have dominion over us. Bestow upon us the spirit of devotion which shall prove that it is just and good to obey Thy laws as taught by our Saviour.

O Thou who wert the pilot of the Galilean Lake, the fountain of light of all our days, enable us to lift the galling burdens of grief and pain and hold high the torch of faith before the winding paths of clamor and strife. As we touch life's throng and press with its great

heart and yet with its greater heartache, lead us to apply the cooling balm to feverish pain and fear. Bless us with the spirit of humble service and cause us to follow in the ways of a beautiful humility and nobility of soul. Dear Lord, we wait at the altar; the times are nervously sensitive; we urgently pray that Thy servants may heed Thy word: "Wisdom resteth in the heart of him who hath understanding and the tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright." In the name of Him who manifested to the world the glory of deathless love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On February 19, 1943:

H. R. 1446. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes.

On March 2, 1943:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very interesting and timely article on lend-lease by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## LEND-LEASE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Maj. Gen. C. M. Wesson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SNYDER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## BREAD-SLICING BAN

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when the American housewife goes to the grocery today, she can again buy sliced bread as she bought it before the ban on bakery slicing was imposed by Food Distribution Administration Order No. 1 on January 18. As you know, Food Administrator Wickard rescinded the slicing ban yesterday.

Mr. Wickard deserves credit for acting with good Hoosier horse sense in this matter, and I want to be among the first to congratulate him. I am confident he was not responsible for the order in the